


The California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act



1993 to 1995 Status Report

Pete Wilson
Governor
State of California

Douglas P. Wheeler
Secretary for Resources
The Resources Agency

Elin D. Miller
Director
Department of Conservation

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATION

DIVISION OF MINES AND GEOLOGY

DIVISION OF OIL, GAS, AND GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF RECYCLING

801 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814-3528

Phone (916) 322-1080

FAX (916) 445-0732

TDD (916) 324-2555

September 1, 1996

Dear Reader:

In 1994, California's agricultural production value for the first time topped \$20 billion. At the same time, the state's population continues to grow by 500,000 people annually. As the most populous and agriculturally productive state in the nation, California faces difficult challenges in making room for its new residents and at the same time preserving the phenomenal productivity of its agricultural industry.

For over 30 years, California's Land Conservation Act--commonly referred to as the Williamson Act after its author John Williamson--has protected the state's vital farmland and open space from premature development. The program works by allowing private landowners to voluntarily restrict the uses of their land to farming and open space through minimum ten-year contracts with local governments. Parcels restricted by these contracts are subject to lower property tax assessments.

Nearly 16 million of the state's 30 million acres of farm and ranch land are currently protected under the Williamson Act. This level of participation has been maintained for over ten years, pointing to the continuing popularity and effectiveness of the program. Particularly in counties such as Kern, Fresno, and Tulare--the top three agricultural counties in the Nation in terms of production value--the objectives of the Williamson Act are more important than ever. High levels of program participation in these counties have preserved vital agricultural lands in the midst of phenomenal growth and development in the Central Valley and elsewhere.

Interest in the Williamson Act and land conservation has increased rapidly in recent years. In 1995, Governor Wilson appointed an advisory committee on the Williamson Act to investigate methods for investigating Williamson Act issues. Also in 1995, the passage of Senate Bill 275 (Statutes of 1995, Chapter 931) created the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program (ALSP) Fund, which will support the purchase of agricultural land conservation easements. In 1996, Governor Wilson, working in conjunction with the Department of Conservation secured Congressional support for inclusion of a national Farmland Protection Program (FPP) in the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act (Farm Bill). The FPP will provide matching funds for state programs such as the ALSP.

As we approach the new millennium, the conservation of farmland and open space will undoubtedly remain as a topic of indispensable concern. While other programs and tools will be useful in preserving California's agricultural resources, every indication points to the continuance of the Williamson Act as one of the state's principal policies in addressing this topic.

Sincerely,

Elin D. Miller
Director

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | ii |
| <i>Executive Summary</i> | iii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Enrollment Patterns | 5 |
| New Legislation | 20 |
| Recent Legal Decisions | 22 |
| Administrative Activities | 23 |
| Special Study | 27 |
| <i>Appendix: Enrollment Data</i> | 33 |
| <i>References</i> | 52 |
| <i>Williamson Act and Related Departmental Publications</i> | 53 |
| <i>Table 1. Purposes of the Williamson Act</i> | 2 |
| <i>Table 2. Principles of Compatible Use</i> | 3 |
| <i>Table 3. Definitions of Williamson Act Prime Land</i> | 5 |
| <i>Table 4. Total Williamson Act Acreage</i> | 12 |
| <i>Table 5. Net Enrollment Changes</i> | 13 |
| <i>Table 6. New Enrollments</i> | 13 |
| <i>Table 7. Nonrenewals Initiated</i> | 14 |
| <i>Table 8. Nonrenewals Expired</i> | 14 |
| <i>Table 9. Cumulative Nonrenewal Proportions</i> | 15 |
| <i>Table 10. Contract Cancellations</i> | 16 |
| <i>Table 11. Public Acquisitions</i> | 17 |
| <i>Table 12. Proportions of Williamson Act Land Valued Under Proposition 13 Provisions</i> | 18 |
| <i>Table 13. Subvention Payment Amounts</i> | 19 |
| <i>Table 14. The Williamson Act Advisory Committee</i> | 23 |
| <i>Table 15. Topics for Consideration by the Williamson Act Advisory Committee</i> | 24 |
| <i>Table 16. Major Agricultural Easement Programs Funded by State Governments</i> | 29 |
| <i>Figure 1. Williamson Act Enrollment 1967 - 1995</i> | 6 |
| <i>Figure 2. Williamson Act Enrollment Activity Trends 1986 - 1995</i> | 7 |
| <i>Figure 3. Proportions of Termination Activity 1986 - 1995</i> | 8 |
| <i>Figure 4. Proportions of Williamson Act Land Categories</i> | 9 |
| <i>Figure 5. Williamson Act Land in Relation to Total Statewide Farmland Composition</i> | 10 |
| <i>Figure 6. Williamson Act Regions</i> | 11 |
| <i>Figure 7. Alternative Uses of Williamson Act Land Acquired for Public Improvement</i> | 17 |

Acknowledgments

The Williamson Act Status Report is produced by the California Department of Conservation's Office of Land Conservation. The Office of Land Conservation is comprised of three separate but related programs: the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the Williamson Act Program, and the Soil Resources Protection Program. The Williamson Act Program and Soil Resources Protection Program are grouped together under the managerial heading of Land Conservation Unit; the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program is managed independently. Major contributions to this report were made by the following Department staff:

Michael J. Doleman, Land & Water Use Analyst research, data analysis, writing, layout
Patricia L. Gatz, Associate Program Analyst research
Anne M. Hazen, Program Assistant proofreading
Paula Hernandez, Executive Secretary proofreading
Jane Irwin, Assistant Director for Administration project direction
Marta Kravech, Associate Program Analyst production assistance
Laura Russell, Student Assistant research, data analysis
Kenneth E. Trott, Unit Manager project supervision
Charles A. Tyson, Associate Land & Water Use Analyst research
Dale Will, Staff Counsel legal research

The Department thanks the planners and assessors of the 47 counties and 15 cities participating in the Williamson Act Program. This report would not be possible without their expertise and assistance.

Executive Summary

The California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act of 1965 is the principal policy for the “preservation of a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural land” in the state (Government Code Section 51220). The Act creates an arrangement whereby private landowners voluntarily restrict their land to agriculture and compatible open-space uses under 10-year rolling term contracts with counties and cities. In return, restricted parcels are assessed for property tax purposes at a rate consistent with their actual use, rather than potential market value. Under the Open Space Subvention Act, local governments are partially compensated by the state for property tax revenues foregone as a result of participation in the program.

Local governments are responsible for the administration of contracts with landowners. The Department of Conservation is responsible for interpretation of the Williamson Act; research of related issues and policies; implementation assistance; certifying applications for state payment under the Open Space Subvention Act; and preparing the status report.

Enrollment Patterns

- ◆ As of March 1, 1995, about 15.9 million acres were enrolled under Williamson Act contract in 47 counties and 15 cities. This number represents over half of California’s total farmland and nearly one-third of all private land in the state.
- ◆ About one-third of the land enrolled under contract is classified as prime agricultural land.
- ◆ About 4.3 percent of the enrolled acreage is in the process of nonrenewal.
- ◆ Enrollment has been stable for over ten years, and should remain so at least into the near future.
- ◆ The number of acres newly enrolled has remained more stable than contract terminations over the last ten years.
- ◆ About 43 percent of the total enrolled acreage is concentrated in the San Joaquin Valley. While leading the state in new enrollments since 1993, the San Joaquin Valley saw a minor net decrease in enrollment of about 500 acres.
- ◆ The Bay & Central Coast region holds the second highest enrollment concentration, with about 20 percent of the total. The region experienced a net increase in enrollment of over 9,000 acres between 1993 and 1995.
- ◆ The Sacramento Valley holds the third largest enrollment concentration--about 16 percent of the total. The region saw the largest net decrease between 1993 and 1995--over 19,000 acres.
- ◆ The North Coast & Mountain region holds about 9 percent of the state’s total enrollment. Between 1993 and 1995 the region saw the largest net increase, with nearly 17,000 acres added.
- ◆ The Foothill & Sierra and South Coast & Desert regions each hold roughly a 5 percent concentration of the state’s Williamson Act land. The Foothill & Sierra region experienced a net increase of about 4,500 acres; the South Coast & Desert region saw a net decrease of about 9,000 acres between 1993 and 1995.

New Legislation

- ◆ *Assembly Bill 2663, Statutes of 1994, Chapter 1251*, clarified provisions relative to compatible uses and added language to the Open Space Subvention Act allowing the state to withhold unpaid cancellation fees from subventions.
- ◆ *Senate Bill 1534, Statutes of 1994, Chapter 1158*, made substantive changes to provisions regarding the public acquisition of Williamson Act land.
- ◆ *Senate Bill 275, Statutes of 1995, Chapter 931*, created the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program (ALSP) Fund to support the purchase of agricultural conservation easements.
- ◆ *The 1996 Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act* established a national Farmland Protection Program (FPP) to support state agricultural easement programs.

Recent Legal Decisions

- ◆ *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus*. The court found the county's conclusion that a proposed project would not induce development to be unsupported by the fact that lands surrounding the project were enrolled under Williamson Act contract.
- ◆ *Carter v. City of Porterville*. The court found that blanket protests by cities of Williamson Act contracts are invalid even if filed before the repeal of the contract protest provisions.
- ◆ *DeVita v. County of Napa*. The court upheld a Napa County initiative which requires General Plan amendments involving farmland conversion to be submitted for county voter approval.

Administrative Activities

- ◆ Department staff have provided technical and administrative support to the Williamson Act Advisory Committee, which was initiated by the Governor in late 1994.
- ◆ The Department has initiated the development of a computer database to increase the accuracy of Williamson Act enrollment information and enhance analytical capabilities.
- ◆ Continuing with the development of a comprehensive reference manual for the Williamson Act, the Department plans to complete the project by late 1996.
- ◆ The Department is engaged in several research projects involving the Williamson Act and land conservation issues. These include a survey of local Williamson Act administrative procedures, a study of alternatives to the minimum parcel size standards of the Williamson Act, and a study of the relationship between urban densities and agricultural land preservation. Featured in this report is an article presenting research on farmland protection programs in other states.
- ◆ The Department completed work on a California version of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model. The LESA model is an innovative way to formally evaluate the character and relative quality of land for agricultural use. Senate Bill 850 (Statutes of 1993, Chapter 812) directs the Resources Agency to adopt the LESA model or similar methodology as part of the Guidelines to Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Introduction

The California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act of 1965 is the state's principal policy for the preservation of agricultural and open-space land. It is a voluntary, locally administered program that provides a mechanism for local governments to protect farmland and open space in cooperation with owners of the land. Landowners enroll parcels under minimum 10-year contracts with local governments to restrict lands to agriculture and compatible open-space uses. In return, land is assessed for property taxes at a rate consistent with its actual use, rather than potential market value. The Act declares as its fundamental purposes (1) agricultural land preservation, (2) open space preservation, and (3) efficient urban growth patterns (Table 1).

The Williamson Act directs the Department of Conservation to prepare and submit to the Legislature a biennial report on the status of the program's implementation. The original requirement for an annual report was changed to a biennial report in 1993 to cut costs, and in recognition of the fact that enrolled acreage does not fluctuate significantly on an annual basis.

Brief History of the Program

Since World War II, California has experienced rapid expansion in virtually every category of growth: since 1940 the population of California has more than quadrupled, from seven million to over 30 million people; between 1963 and 1989 the Gross State Product increased from \$65.9 billion to \$697.3 billion; and since 1970, over five million new permits for residential construction have been authorized (Department of Finance 1992; Fay 1993).

These phenomenal rates of growth, while providing tremendous economic opportunities, increased pressures to convert agricultural land to urban uses. Adding impetus to this trend was the state's property tax system. Rapidly escalating property taxes presented an often prohibitive burden for farmers who wanted to keep their land in agriculture.

In 1963 the California Assembly formed an interim committee to generate a solution that would be acceptable to a variety of interests, including owners of agricultural land, local governments, and land developers

(Davies 1972). The legislation eventually produced by the committee focused on the implementation of restrictive use contracts between local governments and landowners. Assembly Bill 2117, authored by Assemblyman John Williamson, provided for contracts that would prevent development of enrolled parcels for a minimum of 10 years.

Proponents of the legislation felt that contractual restrictions on development should influence assessed land values to the point where they would level off (Snyder 1966). In practice, however, landowners, assessors, and local governments seemed unconvinced that restrictive contracts could provide a basis for lower tax assessments. In the two years following passage of the Williamson Act, only 200,000 acres were enrolled under contract in six counties.

The program might have remained small if not for the addition of Article 28 (now part of Article 13) to the state's Constitution. Article 13 declares the interest of the state in preserving open-space land and provides a constitutional basis for valuing property according to its actual use. The amendment had originated with groups interested in the preservation of open-space

Agricultural Land Preservation:

... the preservation of a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural land is necessary to the conservation of the state's economic resources, and is necessary not only to the maintenance of the agricultural economy of the state, but also for the assurance of adequate, healthful and nutritious food for future residents of this state and nation.

Open Space Preservation:

... in a rapidly urbanizing society agricultural lands have a definite public value as open space, and the preservation in agricultural production of such lands ... constitutes an important physical, social, aesthetic, and economic asset to existing or pending urban or metropolitan developments.

Efficient Urban Growth Patterns:

... the discouragement of premature and unnecessary conversion of agricultural land to urban uses is a matter of public interest and will be of benefit to urban dwellers themselves in that it will discourage discontinuous urban development patterns which unnecessarily increase the costs of community services to community residents.

Table 1. Purposes of the Williamson Act (Government Code Section 51200).

land. Agricultural interests added their support after recognizing the importance of a constitutional backing for preferential tax assessments. Article 13 allows preferential assessments for recreational, scenic, and natural resource areas as well as areas devoted to production of food and fiber.

Supporters of the Williamson Act had hoped that financial assistance from the state to local governments would be part of the program. They believed financial support would provide a tangible incentive for local governments to initiate more contracts by partially replacing property tax revenues lost on enrolled land. State funding was provided in 1971 by the Open Space Subvention Act, which created a formula for allocating payments to local governments based on acreage enrolled in the program.

More than 30 years after its passage, the objectives of the Williamson Act have only increased in importance, and participation in the program remains strong.

As of March 1, 1995, about 15.9 million acres were enrolled under Williamson Act contract in 62 participating local jurisdictions (47 counties and 15 cities). Thus, more than half of the state's approximately 30 million agricultural acres are protected under the Williamson Act.

Background to How the Program Works

At the heart of the Williamson Act is the voluntary enrollment of land under restrictive use contracts between landowners and local governments. This feature creates a partnership between local governments, landowners, and the state for managing the program and designating the lands which should be protected. Contractual agreements ensure mutual benefits are realized both by private landowners and the public.

Agricultural Preserves

Agricultural preserves allow local jurisdictions to designate priority areas for farmland and open space conservation. The establishment of a preserve indicates the willingness of the jurisdiction to enroll parcels within the preserve under Williamson Act contract. Agricultural preserves must generally be at least 100 acres in size. Smaller preserves may be established if they are necessary due to the unique agricultural enterprises of the area in question.

Contract Enrollment

To be eligible for enrollment under contract, land must be within the boundaries of an agricultural preserve. Every contract must run for a minimum term of 10 years; most jurisdictions have adopted 10 years as a standard. On each anniversary date of the contract's execution, the term is automatically extended for another year unless nonrenewal has been initiated.

During the contract's regular term and nonrenewal period, use of the subject

property must adhere to standards of compatibility with agriculture. Principles of compatible use are outlined under the Williamson Act (Table 2). Each contract must either contain or reference a listing of the specific uses which are allowed.

Contract Termination

The preferred method of contract termination is through the nonrenewal process. Under this arrangement the automatic annual term extension is halted and the contract becomes void at the end of its term. The nonrenewal process may be initiated by either party to the contract. Local governments may initiate the nonrenewal process by removing land under contract from the boundaries of an agricultural preserve.

The Williamson Act also allows for the immediate cancellation of contractual restrictions under extraordinary circumstances and when specified conditions can be met. Only the landowner may initiate a request for cancellation. In granting

- 1. The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject land.*
- 2. The use will not significantly displace or impair agricultural operations on the subject land or other contracted land. Uses that displace agricultural operations may be deemed compatible if they relate directly to the processing of commercial agricultural products on the subject land.*
- 3. The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural or open-space use.*

For lands defined as nonprime under the Williamson Act limited exceptions to the first two principles listed above may apply based on specific findings.

Table 2. Principles of Compatible Use (Government Code Section 51283.1, added by AB 2663, Statutes of 1994, Chapter 1251).

approval, local governments must find that the cancellation is either (1) consistent with the purposes of the Williamson Act, or (2) in the public interest.

Contract cancellation requires the payment of a fee equal to 12.5 percent of the full market value of the subject land. The market value is determined according to the proposed alternative use of the land. The fee can be waived or postponed only under very limited circumstances, and under the condition of findings which are more rigorous than those for cancellation alone. The fees are paid by the landowner to the local government which, in turn, pays the fees to the State Controller for deposit into the state's Soil Conservation and General Funds.

In addition to nonrenewal and cancellation, Williamson Act contracts become void when the subject property is acquired by an agency for public improvement. It is the policy of the state, however, to avoid locating public improvements in agricultural preserves. The Williamson Act specifies two conditions in which land may not be acquired for public improvement: (1) if the primary basis for the consideration of the location is the lower cost of land within an agricultural preserve, or (2) if the land in question is prime agricultural land enrolled under Williamson Act contract and there is other land within or outside the preserve on which it is reasonably feasible to locate the public improvement.

For contracts initiated prior to January 1, 1991, incorporated cities had the option of filing a protest if the land for which the contract was executed was within one mile of the city boundary. If a valid protest was filed and the land in question is later annexed to the city, the contract may be

terminated at the option of the city. Due to legislative changes, cities no longer hold the option of protesting contract enrollments. Protests properly filed before 1991, however, are still valid.

Subvention Payments

The Open Space Subvention Act provides for the partial replacement of local property tax revenues foregone as a result of participation in the Williamson Act Program. Local governments receive annual subvention payments for eligible lands at a rate of \$5.00 per acre for prime land and \$1.00 per acre for nonprime land.

Program Administration

Participating local governments are responsible for the general administration of agricultural preserves and Williamson Act contracts. Each participating local government has developed its own specific rules for local program administration, including the basic procedures for processing requests to define agricultural preserves and initiate Williamson Act contracts.

The Williamson Act Program is administered at the state level by the Department of Conservation. Most of the basic administrative activities related to the program are conducted by the Department's Office of Land Conservation (OLC). Office of Land Conservation staff are responsible for the interpretation of the Williamson Act; conducting research of issues and policies related to the Act; providing implementation assistance; certifying applications for state payment under the Open Space Subvention Act; and preparing the status report.

Enrollment Patterns

The volume of activities which affect Williamson Act land throughout the state is usually relatively high at any given point in time. These activities, however, generally do not result in large annual fluctuations in the total number of enrolled acres on a statewide basis. On a county-wide or region-wide basis, however, these activities may result in more noticeable changes. A complete set of data describing these activities is available for all participating jurisdictions in the Appendix.

About the Data

Data for this status report was gathered via applications for payment under the Open Space Subvention Act. The applications report, on a lien year basis, local changes in the amount and status of Williamson Act land. The lien year, which begins and ends on March 1, is used for various tax assessment procedures. Applications received during 1995 report changes which occurred between March 1, 1994, and March 1, 1995.

Williamson Act land is classified as either prime or nonprime (Table 3). These categories exist primarily for determining subvention payment amounts. Nonprime

land, which typically consists of grazing and range land, is also referred to as Open Space of Statewide Significance. Urban prime land, while no longer a separate category for subvention payments, is recorded for purposes of data analysis.

When a nonrenewal is initiated, the contract remains in effect during the phase-out period. At any point in time, therefore, a small portion of the total land enrolled under contract is in the process of nonrenewal. For reporting purposes there are two possible methods for describing the effect of nonrenewals on total acreage. A nonrenewal may be counted as acreage lost from the program at the time it is initiated, or at the time it expires, nine years later.

- ◆ *Land qualifying for rating I or II in the land use capability classifications of the USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service, or rating 80 through 100 in the Storie Index Rating.*
- ◆ *Land with a livestock capacity of at least one animal unit per acre/year.*
- ◆ *Land planted with trees, vines, bushes or crops with a nonbearing period of less than five years which annually return not less than \$200 per acre during the bearing period from unprocessed agricultural plant production.*
- ◆ *Land which has returned from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant products an annual gross value of not less than \$200 per acre for three of the previous five years.*

Table 3. Definitions of Williamson Act Prime Land (Government Code Section 51201c).

For calculating the total number of enrolled acres, nonrenewals are counted as acreage lost upon their *expiration*. For analyzing net changes and regional enrollment patterns, however, nonrenewals are counted as acreage lost at the time they are *initiated*. This method allows comparisons of the points at which landowners decide to begin nonrenewal.

Contracts terminated through public acquisition and city annexation are grouped into a single category in this report. City annexations, however, comprise only a small proportion (roughly 4 percent) of acreage in the category, and are confined to a few counties. In the 1994/95 lien year, for example, contracts were terminated through city annexation on about 1,500 acres statewide--roughly 280 acres in Riverside County, 780 acres in San Joaquin County, 120 acres in Tulare County, and 330 acres in Yolo County. For the sake of clarity, the category is labeled according to its largest component, i.e., public acquisition.

The acreage of particular parcels is routinely affected by resurveys, minor boundary adjustments, parcel size re-

calculations, and other planning and assessment activities. While these activities do not terminate or initiate contracts, they nonetheless affect the amount of enrolled acreage.

Historical Trends

When the program was initiated in 1965, local assessors had no criteria for the valuation of land enrolled under Williamson Act contract. Enrolled parcels were assessed in essentially the same way they had been prior to the Act: according to speculation-driven market value. Consequently, only 200,000 acres in six counties were enrolled under Williamson Act contract in the program's first year.

With the addition of Article 28 (now part of Article 13) to the state constitution in 1966, however, assessors were provided with a basis for making property valuations according to the actual use of the land. New enrollments increased rapidly beginning in 1967, and the trend accelerated with the passage of the Open Space Subvention Act




Figure 1. Williamson Act Enrollment 1967 - 1995.

in 1971 (Figure 1). By 1972 nearly 10 million acres were enrolled. Significant increases continued until enrollment reached well over 16 million acres in 1981.

In 1982, about one million acres were transferred from enrollment under Williamson Act contract to the Department of Forestry's Timber Production Zone Program--a restrictive use arrangement similar to the Williamson Act. A modest rate of increase resumed over the following four years, with enrollment again approaching 16 million acres by 1986.

Recent Trends

As of March 1, 1995, about 15.9 million acres were enrolled under Williamson Act contract statewide. This number represents over half of California's total farm

and ranch land, and nearly one-third of all privately held land in the state.

This level of enrollment has remained relatively stable over the last ten years. Since 1986, about 925,000 acres have been removed from the program while about 815,000 acres have been added (Figure 2). These figures translate to a net decrease in statewide enrollment of about 110,000 acres, resulting in a change of less than seven-tenths of one percent compared to the 1986 total. This relative stability indicates the program has attained a position of maturity which seems likely to endure at least into the near future.

The program's stability, however, has not resulted from low levels of activity. The absolute *volume* of activity over the last ten years has actually been high compared to much of the program's earlier period.




Figure 2. Williamson Act Enrollment Activity Trends 1986 - 1995. Note that the range of the chart causes fluctuations to appear much greater than they actually are in relation to total acreage.




Figure 3. Proportions of Termination Activity 1986 - 1995.

Enrollment stability has resulted from the fact that contract terminations have generally been balanced by new enrollments.

Since 1986, net changes to Williamson Act enrollment have annually equaled less than one-half of one percent of total acreage. The largest net gain occurred during the 1986/87 lien year, when the program enjoyed an overall increase of about 57,000 acres. The highest net loss occurred during the 1990/91 lien year, when enrollment decreased by about 77,000 acres.

In the past three years, the magnitude of annual net changes has tapered off dramatically. During the 1992/93 lien year, for example, only about 61,000 acres were removed from the program, with only slightly fewer acres added. These changes resulted in a negligible net loss of only about 350 acres. Between 1993 and 1995 a small net gain of about 1,500 acres was realized.

New enrollments have generally remained more stable than total terminations

from year to year. Over the last ten years, new enrollments have fluctuated from a high of about 147,000 acres added in the 1988/89 lien year, to a low of about 60,000 acres added in the 1994/95 lien year--a spread of about 87,000 acres. During the same period, the spread between the highest and lowest number of total contract terminations was about 126,000 acres--fluctuating from a high of about 176,000 acres in the 1990/91 lien year, to a low of about 50,000 acres in the 1994/95 lien year.

The types of contract terminations have varied widely in proportion to one another since 1986 (Figure 3). The acreage of nonrenewals initiated, for example, has ranged from 33 percent (1994/95 lien year) to nearly 90 percent (1987/88 lien year) of the total acreage terminated. Cancellations have ranged from about 1 percent (1990/91 lien year) to 11 percent (1994/95 lien year) of total terminations, while public acquisitions of contracted land have ranged

from about 8 percent (1987/88 lien year) to 60 percent (1993/94 lien year).

Nonrenewals have historically accounted for at least half of the number of terminations in any given year. Continuing a trend begun during the 1990/91 lien year, however, the proportion of nonrenewal acreage to other types of terminations dropped below 50 percent during the 1993/94 lien year. The decreasing proportion of nonrenewal activity has been replaced almost in-kind by terminations in the public acquisition category. Sustaining long-term historical trends, cancellations have continued to account for only a minor proportion of total terminations.

Acreage Composition: Prime vs. Nonprime

Over one-third of the land currently enrolled under contract is defined as prime agricultural land by the Williamson Act (Figure 4). About 11 percent of this third (roughly 4 percent of the total enrolled) consists of land classified as urban prime. The remaining prime land falls under the conventional prime classification and is referred to, for the sake of clarity, as 'other' prime.

Some critics have contended that the Williamson Act Program protects primarily range and grazing land as opposed to the state's highest quality agricultural land. These critics support their argument by correctly noting that two-thirds of the land enrolled under Williamson Act contract is classified as nonprime. This statistic alone, however, gives a misleading impression of the program if not considered in context.

The sale of cattle and calves, for example, ranks third among dollar values for

all California agricultural commodities (California Department of Food and Agriculture 1995). The production of this commodity group is supported primarily on range and grazing lands. While these lands usually do not qualify for prime classification under the Williamson Act because their *per acre* production value is not high enough, they nonetheless sustain some of the state's most important agricultural activities. The 10 million acres of nonprime land enrolled under Williamson Act contract clearly represent a vital agricultural resource.




Figure 4. Proportions of Williamson Act Land Categories.

Even more compelling are statistics illustrating the proportion of the state's irrigated farmland protected by the Williamson Act. The phenomenal productivity of California's agricultural land is fundamentally a result of the availability of water for irrigation. The vast majority of the state's high value crops, in fact, are produced with the application of irrigation water. The number of irrigated acres is thus the best available measure of California's most valuable farmland--i.e., its prime agricultural land.




Figure 5. Williamson Act Land in Relation to Total Statewide Farmland Composition.

In 1994, California's total farm and ranch land consisted of nearly eight million acres of irrigated farmland and about 22 million acres of other farm and ranch land (California Department of Food and Agriculture 1995). Williamson Act land categories are defined such that Williamson Act prime lands are almost certain to be irrigated. With about 5.6 million acres of prime land enrolled under contract, the Williamson Act thus protects over 70 percent of the state's total irrigated farmland (Figure 5). In other words, a far greater proportion of the state's most valuable farmland is protected by the Williamson Act compared to the amount of range land and grazing land which is protected.

Notwithstanding these arguments, one of the fundamental purposes stated for the Williamson Act is the preservation of open-space land. The preservation of land for open space encompasses less tangible merits. These lands, which include California's oak savannah, offer immeasurable scenic and

recreational values. Perhaps just as important, nonprime lands form portions of upland watersheds whose protection from unnecessary subdivision and development is important to water quality, fisheries and downstream flood management. The benefits of the Williamson Act in protecting nonprime land are of considerable significance, and not necessarily less than the benefits of protecting prime lands.

Regional Patterns

Forty-seven counties and 15 cities currently participate in the Williamson Act Program. The amount of contracted acreage and level of enrollment activity varies widely between these jurisdictions. To analyze patterns of enrollment activity, counties are clustered into six regions: Bay & Central Coast, Foothill & Sierra, North Coast & Mountain, Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, and South Coast & Desert (Figure 6).

Williamson Act Regions




Figure 6. Counties not filled-in do not participate in the Williamson Act.

Counties are aggregated primarily on the basis of their location and sharing of similar land use and farming characteristics with other counties in the region. The regions were first devised for the 1989 Department of Conservation report *Land in the Balance: Williamson Act Costs, Benefits, and Options*. For the sake of clarity, only counties are included in the regions; the 15 cities together account for only about 45,000 acres of enrolled land--about two-tenths of one percent of the statewide total.

Total Enrolled Acreage

About 45 percent of the total statewide Williamson Act acreage is concentrated in the San Joaquin Valley region (Table 4). In terms of output value, the San Joaquin Valley is undoubtedly the state's most important agricultural region; it includes the nation's top three agricultural counties by value of production--Fresno, Tulare, and Kern. Together these counties account for about \$7.5 billion of California's \$20 billion annual agricultural production value (California Department of Food and Agriculture 1995).

In addition to holding the largest share of enrolled acreage, the San Joaquin Valley also contains the highest proportion of prime Williamson Act land. Nearly 60 percent of the region's enrolled acreage is classified as prime. The average proportion of prime to nonprime for all six regions is about 23 percent.

In terms of net changes, it is interesting that the state's traditional farming regions--the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys--experienced net enrollment losses while the Foothill & Sierra and North Coast & Mountain regions experienced significant net gains between 1993 and 1995 (Table 5).

Although these patterns must be due to many factors, studies indicate that the urbanization of agricultural land in traditional farming regions is directly linked to the opening of previously unfarmed areas to agricultural production (e.g., Jones and Stokes 1991). It would be simplistic to conclude that for every acre of farmland converted on the floors of the Sacramento or San Joaquin valleys there is an acre of new farmland added in other areas. If, however, Williamson Act enrollment is an indicator of broad farmland patterns, then a trend along these lines may be suggested.

| Region | Prime Land | | | Non-prime | Total |
|------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Bay & Central Coast | 53,795 | 250,353 | 304,147 | 2,825,425 | 3,129,572 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 1,495 | 59,266 | 60,761 | 724,931 | 785,692 |
| North Coast & Mountain | 479 | 173,117 | 173,596 | 1,411,749 | 1,585,345 |
| Sacramento Valley | 136,075 | 631,529 | 767,604 | 1,733,754 | 2,501,358 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 387,739 | 3,750,798 | 4,138,537 | 2,800,765 | 6,939,303 |
| South Coast & Desert | 84,610 | 115,673 | 200,283 | 706,128 | 906,411 |
| Totals | 664,193 | 4,980,736 | 5,644,929 | 10,202,752 | 15,847,681 |

Table 4. Total Williamson Act Acreage (as of March 1, 1995).

| Region | Contract Terminations | | | | New Enrollments | Acreage Adjustments | Net Change |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | Non-renewals Initiated | Cancellations | Public Acquisitions | Total | | | |
| Bay & Central Coast | 4,888 | 265 | 24,447 | 29,600 | 40,090 | (1,382) | 9,108 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 6,962 | 0 | 12 | 6,974 | 11,814 | (321) | 4,519 |
| North Coast & Mountain | 1,007 | 0 | 801 | 1,808 | 22,160 | (3,488) | 16,864 |
| Sacramento Valley | 8,081 | 13 | 22,442 | 30,536 | 10,691 | 210 | (19,635) |
| San Joaquin Valley | 18,147 | 5,480 | 12,582 | 36,209 | 41,526 | (5,787) | (470) |
| South Coast & Desert | 956 | 0 | 10,776 | 11,732 | 3,153 | (322) | (8,901) |
| Totals | 40,041 | 5,758 | 71,060 | 116,860 | 129,434 | (11,090) | 1,484 |

Table 5. Net Enrollment Changes (March 1, 1993 - March 1, 1995).

New Enrollments

Despite an overall net loss in total Williamson Act land of nearly 500 acres, the San Joaquin Valley was first among the six regions in new enrollments. Between 1993 and 1995, over 41,000 acres were newly enrolled in the region (Table 6). This figure represents about 32 percent of the total statewide newly enrolled acreage for the same period. Other than a notably significant proportion (nearly 6,000 acres) in Madera County, the San Joaquin Valley's new enrollments were distributed fairly evenly among all counties in the region.

| Region | 1993/94 Lien Year | 1994/95 Lien Year |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 23,924 | 16,166 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 8,096 | 3,718 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 10,340 | 11,820 |
| Sacramento Valley | 4,464 | 6,227 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 19,523 | 22,003 |
| S. Coast & Desert | 2,236 | 917 |
| Totals | 68,583 | 60,851 |

Table 6. New Enrollments.

The Bay & Central Coast region experienced a similarly high level of new enrollments--over 40,000 acres. Unlike the San Joaquin Valley, however, the Bay & Central Coast region enjoyed an overall net increase in Williamson Act land of about 9,100 acres during the two-year period. About half of the 40,000 newly enrolled acres were added in Monterey County.

In the North Coast & Mountain region about 22,000 acres were newly enrolled under contract between 1993 and 1995. Over half of these enrollments occurred in Lassen County.

New enrollment activity was modest in the Sacramento Valley and Foothill & Sierra regions, with about 11,000 and 12,000 acres of newly enrolled contracts respectively. Tehama County accounted for the largest concentration of new enrollments in the Sacramento Valley, with about 41 percent of the region's total. In the Foothill & Sierra region nearly all new enrollments were concentrated in Mariposa County.

About 3,000 acres were newly enrolled in the South Coast & Desert region between 1993 and 1995, with almost 80 percent concentrated in Ventura County.

Nonrenewals Initiated

Nonrenewals were initiated on about 40,000 acres of enrolled land statewide between 1993 and 1995 (Table 7). Repeating the pattern for new enrollments, the San Joaquin Valley region accounted for the largest single share--over 18,000 acres, or roughly 45 percent of the total.

| Region | 1993/94 Lien Year | 1994/95 Lien Year |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 3,610 | 1,278 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 641 | 6,321 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 949 | 58 |
| Sacramento Valley | 5,134 | 2,947 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 12,234 | 5,913 |
| S. Coast & Desert | 544 | 412 |
| Totals | 23,112 | 16,929 |

Table 7. Nonrenewals Initiated.

In the Sacramento Valley and Foothill & Sierra regions, nonrenewals were initiated on about 8,000 and 7,000 acres respectively. Over half of the acreage for the Foothill & Sierra region was concentrated in El Dorado County.

In the Bay & Central Coast region, nonrenewals were initiated for about 4,900 acres over the two-year period. About 38 percent (roughly 1,800 acres) of this acreage was concentrated in Sonoma County.

The North Coast & Mountain and South Coast & Desert regions experienced low levels of nonrenewal activity, with nonrenewals initiated on only about 1,000 acres in each region between 1993 and 1995. Siskiyou County took up the bulk of the nonrenewal activity in the North Coast & Mountain region, with about 800 acres.

Nonrenewal Expirations

Contract nonrenewals expired on over 80,000 acres statewide between 1993 and 1995--twice the acreage for which nonrenewals were initiated over the same period. These figures mean that only half as much land is currently entering the process of nonrenewal compared to 10 years ago.

About one-third of the acreage for which nonrenewals expired between 1993 and 1995 was concentrated in the Bay & Central Coast region (Table 8). San Luis Obispo and Sonoma counties accounted for the bulk of this concentration, with about 7,800 acres and 6,200 acres respectively.

| Region | 1993/94 Lien Year | 1994/95 Lien Year |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 16,108 | 10,604 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 1,637 | 1,814 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 799 | 1,293 |
| Sacramento Valley | 2,672 | 7,550 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 16,099 | 5,741 |
| S. Coast & Desert | 8,867 | 7,296 |
| Totals | 46,182 | 34,298 |

Table 8. Nonrenewals Expired.

Not far behind the Bay & Central Coast region in terms of expired nonrenewals were the San Joaquin Valley and South Coast & Desert regions, with about 22,000 and 16,000 acres respectively. Roughly 82 percent (about 18,000 acres) of the expirations for the San Joaquin Valley region occurred in Kern County. In the South Coast & Desert region, expired nonrenewals were concentrated primarily in Ventura and Orange counties, with about 7,500 and 4,300 acres respectively.

With about 10,200 acres of expired nonrenewals for the two year period, the Sacramento Valley region accounted for roughly 12 percent of the statewide total. The largest concentrations were in Sacramento and Tehama counties, with about 2,900 and 4,800 acres respectively.

Low levels of nonrenewal expiration occurred in the Foothill & Sierra and North Coast & Mountain regions. About 3,500 nonrenewal acres expired in the Foothill & Sierra region, with roughly one-third of this acreage concentrated in Placer County. The North Coast & Mountain region saw nonrenewals expire on only about 2,100 acres between 1993 and 1995. About 44 percent of these expirations occurred in Mendocino County.

Cumulative Nonrenewals

As of March 1, 1995, the proportion of enrolled acreage in the process of nonrenewal was roughly 4 percent for the state (Table 9). On average, about 5 percent of each region's total enrolled acreage is under nonrenewal. The range runs from a low of about 2 percent in the North Coast & Mountain region, to a high of about 9 percent in both the Foothill & Sierra and South Coast & Desert regions.

Most regions have a higher percentage of their prime--especially urban prime--land under nonrenewal. The regional averages for each category are 24 percent, 9 percent, and 4.5 percent for urban prime, other prime, and nonprime respectively. Between regions, however, the actual proportions vary widely.

About one-third (roughly 213,000 acres) of the state's total cumulative nonrenewal acreage is concentrated in the San Joaquin Valley region. Relative to other regions, however, the San Joaquin Valley

actually has a fairly low *proportion* (about 3 percent) of its enrolled acreage under nonrenewal. Only 8 percent of the region's urban prime and 3 percent of its other prime land is under nonrenewal--proportions significantly lower than the average for all six regions. About 37 percent and 26 percent of the San Joaquin Valley region's cumulative nonrenewal acreage is concentrated in Kern and Stanislaus counties respectively.

The Bay & Central Coast region also has roughly 3 percent (about 97,000 acres) of its total enrolled acreage in the process of nonrenewal. High proportions of this acreage are concentrated in Alameda, San Benito, and Santa Clara counties, with roughly 16,000, 18,000, and 24,000 acres under nonrenewal respectively. The land category composition of the region's cumulative nonrenewal acreage follows very closely the average for all six regions.

| Region | Prime Land | Non-prime | Total |
|---------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 6% | 3% | 3% |
| Foothill & Sierra | 23% | 8% | 9% |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 1% | 2% | 2% |
| Sacramento Valley | 7% | 4% | 5% |
| San Joaquin Valley | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| S. Coast & Desert | 17% | 7% | 9% |
| Totals | 4% | 4% | 4% |

Table 9. Cumulative Nonrenewal Proportions.

The Sacramento Valley region meets the statewide nonrenewal proportion average of about 5 percent with roughly 126,000 acres in the nonrenewal process. The largest concentration of this acreage is in Sacramento County, where about 44,000 acres are under nonrenewal.

With about 71,000 and 86,000 nonrenewal acres respectively, the Sierra & Foothill and South Coast & Desert regions each have equally high proportions (about 9 percent) of their Williamson Act acreage under nonrenewal. About 30 percent of the South Coast & Desert region's nonrenewal acreage is concentrated in Orange County. In fact, about two-thirds of Orange County's Williamson Act land--including nearly all of its urban prime acreage--is under nonrenewal. These figures indicate that urbanization pressures in Orange County have prompted a majority of landowners to opt out of the Williamson Act Program.

The Foothill & Sierra region has the highest proportion of its prime acreage under nonrenewal. Well over two-thirds (about 71 percent) of the region's urban prime land, in fact, and roughly 22 percent of its other prime land are in the process of nonrenewal. Placer County represents the largest concentration, with about 40 percent of its enrolled acreage under nonrenewal.

About 2 percent of enrolled acreage in the North Coast & Mountain region is under nonrenewal. The majority of this acreage (nearly 78 percent) is concentrated in Mendocino County alone. The region has the lowest proportion of its prime land in process of nonrenewal--less than 1 percent.

Cancellations

Due to the difficult findings required for approval, cancellations typically account for a very small fraction of total contract terminations. During the 1993/94 lien year, contracts were canceled for only 145 acres throughout the state (Table 10). This figure represents about three-tenths of 1 percent of the total terminations for that period.

For the 1994/95 lien year, contract cancellations jumped significantly, to 5,613

acres. Of this figure, however, 5,068 acres were accounted for by a single cancellation in Stanislaus County. Cancellation of the Williamson Act status on this land is intended to accommodate the development of a proposed new town. The proposal is controversial, however, and is currently being challenged by interest groups in the Fifth District Court of Appeal.

| Region | 1993/94 Lien Year | 1994/95 Lien Year |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 0 | 265 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 0 | 0 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 0 | 0 |
| Sacramento Valley | 13 | 0 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 132 | 5,348 |
| S. Coast & Desert | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 145 | 5,613 |

Table 10. Contract Cancellations.

Excluding this cancellation from the total, contracts were canceled for only 545 acres throughout the rest of the state. Most of this remaining acreage was concentrated in Madera and Santa Cruz counties.

Public Acquisitions

The proportion of public acquisitions to total contract terminations has increased dramatically over the last five years. During the 1990/91 lien year, public acquisitions accounted for about 16 percent of all terminations. By the 1993/94 lien year this proportion had climbed to about 60 percent. The most recent data indicates this trend may have begun to retreat or at least stabilize; during the 1994/95 lien year public acquisitions accounted for about 55 percent of all terminations.

Between 1993 and 1995, contracts on about 71,000 acres were terminated through public acquisition (Table 11). The largest single shares of this acreage were in the Sacramento Valley and Bay & Central Coast regions, with about 22,000 and 24,000 acres respectively. In the Sacramento Valley region, half of these terminations occurred in Tehama County, with Butte and Sacramento counties also accounting for significant shares of about 3,400 and 3,700 acres respectively. In the Bay & Central Coast region, about half of the public acquisitions were concentrated in Santa Clara County.

| Region | 1993/94 Lien Year | 1994/95 Lien Year |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 20,191 | 4,256 |
| Foothill & Sierra | 10 | 2 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | 796 | 5 |
| Sacramento Valley | 6,191 | 16,251 |
| San Joaquin Valley | 5,931 | 6,651 |
| S. Coast & Desert | 2,485 | 8,291 |
| Totals | 35,604 | 35,456 |

Table 11. Public Acquisitions.

The San Joaquin Valley region and South Coast & Desert region each comprised roughly one-sixth of all public acquisitions (about 13,000 and 11,000 acres respectively). About 25 percent (roughly 3,200 acres) of the San Joaquin Valley region's public acquisitions occurred in Kern County. Riverside County accounted for a nearly 70 percent concentration of the South Coast & Desert region's total.

The Foothill & Sierra and North Coast & Mountain regions each had negligible levels of public acquisition. In the Foothill & Sierra region only 12 acres were terminated through public acquisition between 1993 and 1995--seven acres in Tuolumne County and five acres in El

Dorado County. The North Coast & Mountain region saw 801 acres terminated through public acquisition, all of which were concentrated in Lake County.

During the 1993/94 lien year, the Department of Conservation prepared an analysis of the types of public improvements for which Williamson Act contracts were terminated. While the largest single share of all public acquisitions of Williamson Act land during the period (about 39 percent) were for the purpose of conversion to wildlife habitat (Figure 7), half of all such conversions occurred in Butte County alone. This single acquisition probably represents a somewhat anomalous "spike" in the data. On a continuous basis conversion to wildlife habitat probably does not comprise as large a proportion of the total.




Figure 7. Alternative Uses of Williamson Act Land Acquired for Public Improvement.

Nonetheless, it should be noted that the majority of public improvements on Williamson Act land are for purposes related to open-space use. In other words, Williamson Act land acquired for public improvement does not necessarily lose protection as open space simply by virtue of

being removed from enrollment. In some cases, the land may be acquired for the purpose of placing it under permanent protection. Bearing these facts in mind, the public acquisition of Williamson Act land becomes a less pressing issue in terms of open space preservation.

Water resource management projects, such as flood control, new or expanded reservoirs, and drainage ponds accounted for a 21 percent share of the total. With the available data, about 24 percent of the total publicly acquired land could not be broken into specific alternative use categories. With the adoption of better recording methods, the Department will attempt to provide more comprehensive analysis of this type of data in the future.

Williamson Act Land Valued Under Proposition 13 Provisions

When Proposition 13 was passed in 1978 it was expected that Williamson Act enrollment would decline significantly. In fact, however, the measure had a negligible effect on program participation.

In 1982 the Department of Conservation prepared a study regarding the effects of Proposition 13 on the overall tax benefits of the Williamson Act to landowners. It was discovered that the tax savings realized as a result of participation in the program had dropped by only about 20 percent. The average tax savings still amounted to as much as 83 percent, depending upon how recently the property in question had changed ownership. Even with a base year of 1975, tax reductions were as high as 62 percent.

Proposition 13 had decreased the tax benefits of the Williamson Act, but not nearly enough to discourage landowner participation. With the average base year increasing since 1982, it is likely that the tax

benefits of the Williamson Act have only increased since the study was completed.

Statewide, only about 3 percent of the total land enrolled under the Williamson Act is assessed lower under the provisions of Proposition 13 (Revenue and Taxation Code Section 110.1). This proportion is relatively stable among all six regions (Table 12).

| Region | Prime Land | Non-prime | Total |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| Bay & Central Coast | 8% | 1% | 1% |
| Foothill & Sierra | 2% | 1% | 3% |
| N. Coast & Mountain | -- | -- | -- |
| Sacramento Valley | 9% | 1% | 3% |
| San Joaquin Valley | 7% | 1% | 4% |
| S. Coast & Desert | 5% | -- | 1% |
| Totals | 7% | < 1% | 3% |

Table 12. Proportions of Williamson Act Land Valued Under Proposition 13 Provisions.

Open Space Subvention Payments

Under the Open Space Subvention Act, local governments receive state payments for eligible land enrolled under Williamson Act contract. The payments are made at a rate of \$5.00 per acre for land defined as prime under the Williamson Act, and \$1.00 per acre for other (nonprime) land. Prior to 1993, an additional category, urban prime, provided for payments of \$8.00 per acre. The urban prime category made special recognition of otherwise prime agricultural lands within or near city boundaries. Urban prime lands are still reported to offer a more detailed analysis of enrollment patterns.

Only land which receives the full property tax relief of the Williamson Act is eligible for subvention payment. Land which is in the process of nonrenewal is subject to gradual increases in property tax assessments over the nonrenewal period, and is therefore not eligible for payment. In addition, land which is assessed lower under the provisions of Proposition 13 than under Williamson Act valuation (Revenue and Taxation Code Section 423 and 423.5) is not eligible.

Of the 15.9 million acres of Williamson Act land, about 4 percent are in the process of nonrenewal, and about 3 percent are valued lower under the provisions of Proposition 13 than under the Williamson Act. Thus about 7 percent (roughly one million acres) of the total enrolled acreage is ineligible for state payment under the Open Space Subvention Act.

About five million acres of prime land and about 9.8 million acres of nonprime land are eligible for payment. For the 1994/95 lien year, these figures translated to a total payment amount of close to \$35 million to participating local jurisdictions from the state. This amount has remained stable over the past several years.

The distribution of subvention payments closely match the proportions of total enrolled acreage for each of the six regions (Table 13). In other words, no region has a significantly higher proportion of its total acreage eligible for payment than any other. The San Joaquin Valley thus receives the greatest portion of the total subvention amount--about \$21.2 million. Among the other five regions, payment amounts range from about \$900,000 for the Foothill & Sierra region, to about \$4.9 million in the Sacramento Valley.

| Region | 1993/94 | 1994/95 |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Lien Year | Lien Year |
| Bay & Central Coast | \$3.99 | \$4.03 |
| Foothill & Sierra | \$0.89 | \$0.89 |
| N. Coast & Mountain | \$2.22 | \$2.24 |
| Sacramento Valley | \$4.88 | \$4.87 |
| San Joaquin Valley | \$21.25 | \$21.32 |
| S. Coast & Desert | \$1.42 | \$1.44 |
| Totals | \$34.64 | \$34.79 |

Table 13. Subvention Payment Amounts (in millions).

New Legislation

Major legislative changes have occurred infrequently during the history of the Williamson Act Program. Most of the important questions associated with program implementation were addressed rather early on. While the period since the 1991-93 status report has not been entirely uneventful in terms of legislative actions related to the Williamson Act, the effects of these actions have been primarily for the purpose of clarifying or making technical changes to existing law.

Legislation Affecting the Williamson Act

Senate Bill 1534

Senate Bill 1534 (Statutes of 1994, Chapter 1158) made four substantive changes to government code provisions regarding the public acquisition of lands within agricultural preserves and enrolled under Williamson Act contract.

First, the changes clarify that contract termination through public acquisition is appropriate only for land intended for publicly owned facilities and interests.

Second, findings are required to document that (a) the acquisition of agricultural preserve lands for public improvements--especially contracted and prime agricultural lands--comes only after nonpreserve lands have been determined to be unavailable or unsuitable for the use, and (b) the acquisition is not based on the cost of the land alone.

Third, the changes require Williamson Act lands acquired by public entities to be re-enrolled under contract before they may be returned to private ownership. Finally, changes provide for additional notice to the director of the Department of Conservation when uses or ownership of acquired lands change.

Assembly Bill 2663

Assembly Bill 2663 (Statutes of 1994, Chapter 1251) clarified government code provisions relative to compatible uses allowed on lands within agricultural preserves and enrolled under Williamson Act contract. The primary purpose of the legislation was to add language to the Williamson Act clearly delineating principles of compatibility. Language was also added to define requirements for issuing conditional use permits and to provide specific exceptions to the principles for nonprime land. The additional language provides for the "grandfathering" of uses already in place, in the application approval process, or explicitly set forth in Williamson Act contracts prior to June 4, 1994. The new legislation also added language to address the issue of mining activities on Williamson Act lands.

In addition, language was added by AB 2663 to the Open Space Subvention Act which allows the state to withhold any unpaid contract cancellation fees from subvention payment entitlements. The amendment allows the state to withhold subvention payments for an amount equal to the cancellation fees not received by the State Controller's Office within 30 days of the execution of a certificate of cancellation of a contract plus interest.

Legislation Related to Land Conservation

Senate Bill 275

Senate Bill 275 (Statutes of 1995, Chapter 931) created the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program (ALSP) Fund, to be administered by the Department of Conservation. The bill itself does not provide state funding for the program, but allows gifts, donations, grants, proceeds from the sale of general obligation bonds, federal funds, or other sources to be received and deposited into the ALSP Fund.

The program will become active when the fund contains at least \$1 million. With funding in place, the ALSP will support the purchase of agricultural conservation easements, and may also be used for land improvement and planning grants, technical assistance, and technology transfer activities provided by the Department of Conservation, as well as costs of program administration. Not less than 90 percent of funds available for grants will be expended for the acquisition of interests in land, and not more than 10 percent of funds may be used for land improvement and related purposes.

Potential sources of funding for the ALSP may be provided by two other pieces of legislation. Senate Bill 1280, if passed and signed into law, will allow tax credits for cash or interests in agricultural land donated to the state for the ALSP. House of Representatives (HR) Bill 2429, which was

pending at the time this report was written, would authorize federal grants to programs such as the ALSP.

In addition to these potential funding sources, the Governor's 1996-97 budget proposes to make \$1 million available for the ALSP.

Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996

The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act (Farm Bill), which addresses an extensive range of national agricultural policies, was passed and signed into law in 1996.

Among the conservation provisions of the 1996 Farm Bill is the establishment of a national Farmland Protection Program (FPP). The FPP is a new incentive program designed to provide matching grants to help state farmland conservation programs purchase conservation easements. It is based on voluntary participation and applies to land for which a farmer wishes to preserve his or her land in agriculture in perpetuity.

Up to \$35 million in funding is authorized for the FPP, with the goal of protecting between 170,000 to 340,000 acres of agricultural land from conversion to non-agricultural uses over the next 3 years.

Inclusion of the FPP in the Farm Bill was secured, in part, through the efforts of Governor Wilson working in conjunction with the Department of Conservation. With the ALSP (see above) in place, California is in a position to receive funding from the FPP for the purchase of conservation easements on vital agricultural lands.

Recent Legal Decisions

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus

In a negative declaration of environmental impacts, the county asserted that a proposed project would not contribute to the inducement of development on land near the project. This conclusion was reached, in part, based upon the fact that much of the area surrounding the project was enrolled under Williamson Act contract.

In reaching its result and sending the proposed project back for further review under CEQA provisions, the court declined to rule on whether the proposed project was incompatible with the Williamson Act. However, the decision stated that the fact the surrounding lands were enrolled under Williamson Act contract was inadequate to support the county's conclusion that the proposed project would not induce further development. (At page 157.) *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (February 28, 1995) 33 Cal.App. 4th 144.

Carter v. City of Porterville

This case involved an inverse condemnation claim by owners of property downstream from a defectively designed reservoir. In determining the value of the plaintiff's property taken by the project, a dispute arose regarding whether the property was subject to a Williamson Act contract.

The Court ruled that a Williamson Act contract was indeed in effect on the property, notwithstanding a blanket protest that had been filed by the City of Porterville at the time the contract was executed. Blanket protests by cities attempt to raise a general objection against *any* contract executed within one mile of a city's boundaries, as opposed to protests against *specific* contracts.

The court interpreted the provisions of Assembly Bill 2764 which prospectively repealed provisions of the Williamson Act allowing the protest of contracts by cities, while requiring that protests filed before January 1, 1991 must identify particular parcels and contracts (see Government Code Section 51243.5). This decision means that blanket protests are invalid even if filed before the repeal of the contract protest provisions. (At page 1607.) *Carter v. City of Porterville* (August 19, 1993) 17 Cal.App. 4th 1588.

DeVita v. County of Napa

This case involved a challenge to an initiative passed in Napa County which requires amendments to the General Plan allowing development of agricultural lands to be submitted for approval to county voters. In upholding the initiative, the Supreme Court referred to provisions of the Williamson Act which indicate the state Legislature's recognition of the importance of preserving agricultural lands. (At page 791.) *DeVita v. County of Napa* (March 6, 1995) 9 Cal. 4th 763.

Administrative Activities

The Williamson Act is administered at the state level by the Department of Conservation. The Department is responsible for interpretation of the Act, implementation assistance, research of related issues, and preparing the status report. The Department also has responsibility through the Resources Agency for administration of the open space subvention application process.

Williamson Act Advisory Committee

Since June of 1995, the Department has provided technical and administrative support to the Williamson Act Advisory Committee (WAAC). The WAAC was initiated when the Governor directed the Secretaries of the Resources Agency and Department of Food and Agriculture to convene and co-chair an advisory body for the purpose of investigating Williamson Act

issues. Committee members were appointed by the co-chairs and now include 15 individuals who serve without compensation or reimbursement (Table 14).

The advisory committee outlined a list of major topics to be addressed during the course of its initial 18-month term. The topics were consolidated and arranged into two tiers, based upon priority (Table 15). Since its first meeting in June 1995, the WAAC has convened approximately every six weeks.

Co-Chairs:

Elin D. Miller, Director, Department of Conservation, on behalf of
Douglas P. Wheeler, Secretary, Resources Agency of California
Nita Vail, Director of Natural Resources & Environmental Planning, on behalf
of Ann Veneman, Secretary, California Department of Food and Agriculture

Members:

John Bauke, Resource Landowners Coalition
Gerald Benincasa, Agricultural Commissioner, Tuolumne County
Don Benninghoven, Executive Director, League of California Cities
Linda Falasco, Central Valley Rock, Sand & Gravel
Don Gordon, President, Agricultural Council of California
Charles Harness, Supervisor, Tulare County
Jasper Hempel, Western Growers Association
Linda Jenkins, California Farm Bureau Federation
Jerry Meral, Exec. Director, Cal. Planning and Conservation League
George Misner, Assessor, Kings County
Valerie Nera, Director, Natural Resources, Cal. Chamber of Commerce
Julie Spezia, Exec. Dir., Cal. Assn. of Resource Conservation Districts
Sybrand Vander Dussen, Vander Dussen Associates
Erik Vink, Field Director, American Farmland Trust
Marden Wilber, President, California Cattlemen's Association

Table 14. The Williamson Act Advisory Committee.

Tier One Issues:

1. *Divisions of contracted land;*
2. *Tax benefits of the program;*
3. *Adequacy of state implementation, including:*
 - a. *effectiveness of the Williamson Act and its implementation, including integration with zoning and general plans, and the need for additional statutes of limitations on local Williamson Act decisions; and,*
 - b. *exploration of conservation tools to complement the Williamson Act.*

Tier Two Issues:

1. *Contract cancellation valuations;*
2. *Eligibility of qualified land and uses for contract participation;*
3. *Local implementation of recent amendments to the Williamson Act;*
4. *Statutory changes to contracts in progress; and*
5. *Local control of tax base and land use.*

Table 15. Topics for Consideration by the Williamson Act Advisory Committee.

At the end of its first year of work, the committee will submit to the co-chairs its report to the Governor on its activities, findings, and recommendations for implementation of the Williamson Act. Based upon its progress in addressing each of the major issues, the final report will recommend whether the committee's work should continue beyond the initial term.

Information Systems Development

The tremendous amount of data associated with Williamson Act lands presents a challenging data management task. In the past, the Office of Land Conservation has relied on physical files and computer spreadsheets to tabulate and report this data. It has been recognized, however, that an automated information management system would greatly enhance accuracy, efficiency, and the delivery of services to local governments and other constituents.

The Office of Land Conservation initiated the development of such a system in 1995. Due to budget and staff limitations, this project will likely continue in its development stage for multiple years. Nonetheless, the system already performs many vital record-keeping and data processing operations.

As the data management system develops, new applications and benefits will undoubtedly emerge. In the future, for example, as networking and data transfer technologies become more widespread, it may be possible to automate the entire open space subvention application process.

When the system has moved out of its initial development stage, the Office of Land Conservation plans to produce maps of Williamson Act lands on a statewide basis using geographic information systems (GIS) technology. Many individuals and organizations have expressed frustration over the lack of accurate, high-quality maps of Williamson Act lands for the state. Such a map series would provide valuable planning

and research tools to government agencies, private organizations, and universities.

When these maps have been completed, participating local governments will no longer be required to submit a new jurisdiction-wide map of Williamson Act lands with each annual open space subvention application. Instead, local agencies will only be required to supply the Department of Conservation with information needed to make updates to the Department's automated maps.

Reference Manual

It has been a long-standing goal of the Office of Land Conservation to provide a comprehensive source of reference material on the Williamson Act. A brief instructional handbook was produced soon after the Williamson Act was passed. Besides being long out-of-print, however, this source does not reflect current practices.

The commitment of limited staff resources to more immediate priorities, such as the Williamson Act Advisory Committee, has delayed production of the reference manual. It is anticipated that 1996 will yield opportunities to make significant progress toward completion.

When completed, the manual will serve as both an introductory text on the Williamson Act and also as a definitive guide on program execution for decision makers, planners, assessors, and other local government professionals.

Research Projects

In the performance of its duties the Department of Conservation is empowered to "research, publish, and disseminate information regarding the policies, purposes,

procedures, administration, and implementation" of the Williamson Act (Government Code Section 51206).

Minimum Parcel Size Standards of the Williamson Act

As part of its development of a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment system, the Department conducted an evaluation of the minimum parcel size standards of the Williamson Act. Conducted for the Department by Nichols-Berman Environmental Planners, the study reviewed the merits of the minimum parcel size standards for ensuring that land protected is capable of sustaining agricultural uses. The study also examined practices of participating counties, as well as systems used in other states for implementing similar programs. Finally, the study outlined the pros and cons of alternatives to minimum parcel sizes and recommended optional approaches.

Urban Densities and Agricultural Land Preservation

Recent reports on California's rapid urban growth have renewed concerns over agricultural land conversion. In response, the Department commissioned an assessment of urban densities in the Central Valley, and opportunities for increased development efficiency. Dr. Alvin Sokolow led a group of other researchers at the University of California Cooperative Extension in preparing a draft report, *Municipal Density and Farmland Protection: An Exploratory Study of Central Valley Patterns*. The study is expected to be complete in 1996.

The study includes a comparison of densities in 16 Central Valley cities. The study also examines the planning policies of

these cities and opinions of city officials and land developers, for clues to account for the variability in densities. Based on collected data, the study will offer recommendations for protecting farmland by encouraging more efficient urban densities.

Local Williamson Act Procedures

As part of its support of the Williamson Act Advisory Committee, the Office of Land Conservation conducted a survey of Williamson Act implementation practices in 21 counties. Information from the survey helped to provide the committee with a context for its discussion of program performance.

The survey included a written questionnaire, followed by telephone interviews, and a review of local Williamson Act rules and contracts. The survey covered the following issues: (1) assignment of administration responsibilities among local agencies; (2) role of citizen agricultural advisory committees; (3) regulation of land entry to the Act; (4) compliance with the Act once land is under contract; (5) division of contracted land; and, (6) processing of contract terminations.

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model

Senate Bill 850 (Statutes of 1993, Chapter 812) directed the Department of Conservation to develop a California version of the United States Department of Agriculture's Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model. The task was undertaken by the Office of Land

Conservation. With funding from the USDA, a version was completed early in 1996.

The LESA model is a way to formally evaluate the relative quality of specific lands for agricultural use. The purpose for the development of a California version of the LESA model is to provide a mechanism for determining the significance of project impacts to agricultural lands.

The LESA model generates a numeric score for any particular tract of land using a formula which relies on data related to specific characteristics of the tract. Scores range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating superior suitability for continuing and productive agricultural use.

The Resources Agency was directed by SB 850 to adopt the LESA model or similar methodology as part of the Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Currently, CEQA Guidelines contain only one statement regarding the significance of a proposed project's impact on farmland: a project "... will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will convert prime agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impair the productivity of prime agricultural land" (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et. seq., Appendix G[y]). This relatively imprecise threshold usually leaves the issue of impacts on agricultural resources to subjective arguments.

Once adopted, the LESA model will offer an objective measure of the factors that determine the value of specific agricultural lands to the public. Over 200 states and local governments across the nation currently use LESA for planning, environmental impact assessment, and conservation policies.

Special Study

The following report is a product of research commissioned by the Department of Conservation through the University of California's Cooperative Extension. The principal author is Dr. Alvin D. Sokolow, a Public Policy Specialist with the Extension.

Farmland Policy and Programs: What Can California Learn from Other States?

California state and local governments by some standards are national leaders in the protection of farmland in the face of urban growth. In the Williamson Act we have one of the most refined tax preferential programs for agriculture. Our counties and cities, empowered by state legislation, have a large array of tools for checking urban development in relation to productive farmland--agricultural zoning, right to farm ordinances, residential density standards, infrastructure limitations, etc. On the long-range planning front, such processes as general plan updates and Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) reviews of amended city spheres of influence are meant to provide deliberative, well-designed patterns of urban expansion.

Yet, given the immense population growth of California and steady loss of land to expanding cities and more remote homesites, the suggestion is that available policies and tools--or willingness to apply them in effective ways--are not equal to the task.

The Golden State is not unique in recognizing and responding to the issue of farmland conversion to urban uses. Other state governments and localities also have significant programs for protecting their

farmland acres. Can California learn from their experiences? What particular programs or program features offer useful lessons?

This paper is a brief review of selective farmland protection programs in other states. It was prepared by the Farmland Policy Project of UC Cooperative Extension for the Land Conservation Office of the California Department of Conservation. Much of the detailed description of individual state programs reported here is based on information provided by the Farmland Preservation Report, a monthly journal that tracks farmland policy developments nationwide.

Major Innovations Elsewhere

Most state governments require little of themselves or their local governments to protect farmland and, indeed, to manage growth generally. California has long been an exception, having in place since the 1960s a set of policies and programs for both purposes. There still are states where many rural jurisdictions lack zoning ordinances and where the preparation of general plans is an optional exercise for county and city governments.

In recent years, however, a number of other primarily eastern states have leapfrogged over California in this policy arena to establish and carry out innovative policies. Most of the innovations are in two

areas--the acquisition of conservation easements on farmland and the adoption of statewide planning and land use standards. Also described below, for purposes of comparing California's Williamson Act with similar programs elsewhere, are tax preferential policies for farmland.

Conservation Easements

The most striking recent development in state farmland policy is the creation and expansion of conservation easement programs operated by state and local governments. Last year California became the 15th state with such a policy on its books, with the passage of the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program (SB 275, Costa). This new legislation does not yet have a funding source. However, conservation easement programs for agricultural and open-space lands have been active in several California communities for a number of years, most of them operated by nonprofit land trusts.

As a form of compensation to landowners that does not change their basic ownership status, public agencies or nonprofit organizations acquire agricultural or conservation easements on individual farm or other parcels by purchasing or otherwise accepting their "development rights." Purchase amounts approximate the difference between the agricultural and higher development values of the land. In effect, landowners voluntarily sign away their development options and the land is retained indefinitely in farming or other forms of open space.

Maryland was the first state to establish in 1977 a conservation easement program for farmland. At least eight states currently have funded programs that have acquired easements on substantial amounts

of farmland. All are located in the northeastern sector of the nation in a belt that extends south from New England to Maryland. Within this region, state and state-local programs have acquired more than 300,000 acres of farmland and related open space easements in the last 18 years, at a cost in public funds of more than a half billion dollars. (This does not include the easements acquired by local governments and land trusts independently of state government actions.) Table 16 identifies five of the largest programs. Major features include:

- ◆ Funding sources that include statewide bond issues, real estate transfer taxes, cigarette taxes, and state general funds.
- ◆ State funds are allocated through local governments (counties, municipalities, towns) in most cases, with local matching dollars often provided.
- ◆ Farmland easements in some states are acquired as part of larger open-space programs that also cover habitat protection and historical preservation.
- ◆ A state government oversight role, carried out either by an administrative agency (agriculture or resources) or an independent board, with local government representation in some cases.
- ◆ To allocate funds, formulas establish the eligibility of applicant parcels and rank them, using such factors as (1) agricultural productivity, (2) soil quality, (3) cost of easement purchases, (4) relationship to local plans, (5) relative threat of conversion, and (6) local government match.

The programs appear to be popular with landowners. Reports from individual states indicate that more acres are submitted for easement purchase than can be accommodated within particular funding periods.

| State, Year of Origin | Acres Under Easement | Funding Sources | Annual Funding (millions) | Local Involvement |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| Maryland, 1977 | 100,000+ | real estate transfer tax, bonds, general fund | \$9.6 in fiscal year 1996 | county administration |
| Pennsylvania, 1989 | 68,500 | transfer tax, cigarette tax, bonds | \$22.0 in fiscal year 1995 | counties appraise, municipalities match |
| Massachusetts, 1977 | 40,000 | bonds, general fund | NA | cities and towns nominate parcels |
| New Jersey, 1981 | 28,000 | bonds | NA | counties appraise, determine eligibility, match funds |
| Connecticut, 1978 | 24,800 | bonds | \$5.0 in fiscal year 1995 | none, although law provides for joint acquisitions |

Table 16. Major Agricultural Easement Programs Funded by State Governments (Farmland Preservation Report, Buist 1995. Does not include independent local programs).

Local Government Programs

Either as part of state programs or independently, counties and other local governments in these and other states are heavily involved in acquiring and managing agricultural conservation easements. In most of the active state programs, local governments take on the major administrative tasks, taking applications from landowners, applying the allocation formulas, and arranging for land appraisals. Formula details are often a state-local issue, as local governments in some states compete with each for the available funds. Some county governments in Maryland and Pennsylvania employ full-time farmland preservation

administrators, suggesting the local significance of the easement programs.

The Farmland Preservation Report (September, 1995) identifies 10 counties that have farmland easements on 9,000 or more acres apiece. Suburban Montgomery County, Maryland leads the list with more than 43,000 acres in easements. All of the other counties on the list, but one, are in Maryland or Pennsylvania. The exception is California's Marin County, with two easement programs (Open Space District and the Marin Agricultural Land Trust) funded by a local property tax (pre Proposition 13) and other sources. Not yet included on this top national list but rapidly acquiring

easements is the Sonoma County Open Space District that was created in 1990 when voters approved a quarter-cent sales tax for this purpose. Local programs in other states are funded by property taxes, real estate transfer fees, and bond issues.

Transfer of Development Rights

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs are a different technique for acquiring easements. Instead of the direct expenditure of public funds, local governments facilitate the transfer of development opportunities from farm or other resource parcels to be protected to parcels where development is desirable. In effect, the owner of a developable parcel purchases the development rights from the owner of a protected parcel, usually as a way of mitigating the impacts of the proposed project. Through their land use control, local governments facilitate the transfers by designating "sending" and "receiving" areas.

While still regarded as an experimental technique by some farmland protection advocates, TDRs are fast increasing in popularity. Functioning TDR programs with a record of completed transfers are found in Montgomery and Calvert counties in Maryland and Burlington County and the Pinelands resource region in New Jersey. Two agricultural easements were recently established in Yolo County as mitigation for a housing project in nearby Davis. Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties are now organizing TDR programs.

Comprehensive State Planning

The second major innovation of recent years has been the adoption by a few state governments of comprehensive planning programs, in which local governments are

mandated or strongly urged to follow specific statewide standards for directing urban growth and protecting resource areas. Oregon (1973), Florida (1986), and New Jersey (1992) are the most prominent examples.

The centrality of farmland protection varies in these programs. It is one of the 19 goals of the Oregon plan, requiring counties to adopt exclusive farmland zones with residential limits. The New Jersey plan notes that more than half of the state's farm acres were converted to urban use in 1950-87 and includes farmland as one of five types of planning areas to be established statewide. The Florida Growth Management Law does not explicitly address farmland protection but presumably this is a secondary objective than can be inferred from the policies dealing with compact development.

All three plans emphasize compact urban development. The Florida and New Jersey plans, in addition, dwell on the advantages of reducing the public infrastructure costs of new development by avoiding urban sprawl. While state legislation and executive department actions determine the policy direction, the planning efforts depend entirely on their implementation by local governments, whether operating under mandates or looser standards.

Preferential Tax Programs

With its Williamson Act, California remains a national leader in a third policy area--preferential tax treatment of farmland or agricultural income. Every state has adopted this approach since Maryland created the first such program in 1956. In California and most other states tax relief is provided by reducing the property tax burden on enrolled farmland as an incentive for

landowners to retain their parcels in agriculture. Farmland is typically assessed according to its use value or agricultural income, less than the full market value required for other types of real estate.

Only 12 states, including California, actually impose enforceable restrictions on the development of farm parcels that enjoy the tax benefits. California's program is also more comprehensive than most other states in providing at least partial compensation to local governments for the property tax losses (four states).

Wisconsin's program is worthy of mention because of its reported effectiveness and its contrast with the Williamson Act. It is one of two states that provide the tax relief through state income tax credits for farmland owners, instead of through property tax reductions.

Paid for directly by the state treasury, this program thus avoids the complexity of a Williamson Act-type operation which requires administration by both local (property assessments, contract applications and performance, etc.) and state (oversight, subvention allocations, etc.) governments. By not working through the property tax, it also avoids revenue losses to local governments. Yet, indirectly, the Wisconsin program has stimulated many rural jurisdictions to adopt local farmland protection measures because owners can qualify for the income tax credits only if their parcels are located in townships or counties with exclusive agricultural zoning or pertinent land use plans.

The state income tax credits are determined by the inverse ratio of household income and property tax burden. In 1995, Wisconsin gave a total of \$31 million in tax credits to almost 24,000 farmland owners, for an average of \$1,300 per taxpayer.

How Useful to California?

It would not be easy to apply these innovations from other states to California's menu of farmland protection tools. There are major obstacles here to following the outside leads in both the conservation easement and statewide planning areas. The absence of readily available funding sources and the immense task of developing an effective program for our extensive farmland base are apparent in the case of easements. The reluctance of Californians to dilute local control over land use is a formidable barrier to the creation of statewide planning standards.

Yet, there are practical lessons for California in what others states have accomplished in both policy areas, suggesting a more detailed examination of their programs. The experiences of the eastern states in operating active easement programs offer some useful hints about how to allocate limited resources for farmland protection and about the interplay of state and local government roles. The lessons from the statewide planning programs not only concern the interconnection of state and local responsibilities, but also present some ideas about how changes in the development of urban areas can serve farmland protection goals.

References

- Buist, Henry and others. 1995. Purchase of Development Rights and the Economics of Easements. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Economic Report 718.
- Eppling, John W. 1992. "The New Jersey State Planning Process: An Experiment in Intergovernmental Negotiations." In Growth Management: The Planning Challenge of the 1990s. Jay M. Stein, ed. Newberry Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Farmland Preservation Report, monthly.
- Howe, Deborah A. 1992. "Growth Management in Oregon." In Growth Management: The Planning Challenge of the 1990s. Jay M. Stein, ed. Newberry Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Malme, Jane. 1993. Preferential Property Tax Treatment of Land. Cambridge, Mass.: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Nelson, Arthur C. 1992. "Preserving Prime Farmland in the Face of Urbanization: Lessons from Oregon." Journal of the American Planning Association 58, Autumn, 467-488.

Appendix: Enrollment Data

The tables on the following pages provide a complete county-by-county and city-by-city account of the enrollment activity discussed in this report. All figures describe the number of acres which were involved except Table A.9, which describes the dollar amounts of state payments under the Open Space Subvention Act.

| | |
|--|----|
| Table A.1. Total Williamson Act Contract Enrollment | 34 |
| Table A.2. New Williamson Act Contract Enrollments | 36 |
| Table A.3. Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Initiated | 38 |
| Table A.4. Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Expired | 40 |
| Table A.5. Cumulative Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals | 42 |
| Table A.6. Cancellations of Williamson Act Contract | 44 |
| Table A.7. Public Acquisitions of Williamson Act Contracted Land | 46 |
| Table A.8. Williamson Act Contracted Land not Receiving Tax Relief Benefits | 48 |
| Table A.9. Amounts Paid Under the Open Space Subvention Act | 50 |

Total Williamson Act Contract Enrollment

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | 5,463 | 9,778 | 15,241 | 139,902 | 155,143 | 5,136 | 9,437 | 14,572 | 138,758 | 153,330 |
| Amador | - | 4,478 | 4,478 | 90,036 | 94,514 | - | 4,478 | 4,478 | 90,240 | 94,718 |
| Butte | 13,282 | 92,990 | 106,272 | 103,478 | 209,750 | 13,388 | 93,557 | 106,945 | 103,317 | 210,262 |
| Calaveras | - | 13,541 | 13,541 | 120,254 | 133,795 | - | 13,541 | 13,541 | 120,301 | 133,842 |
| Colusa | - | 10,345 | 10,345 | 190,447 | 200,792 | - | 10,345 | 10,345 | 190,447 | 200,792 |
| Contra Costa | 4,243 | 8,620 | 12,863 | 51,240 | 64,103 | 4,124 | 8,618 | 12,742 | 48,882 | 61,624 |
| El Dorado | - | 2,175 | 2,175 | 45,750 | 47,925 | - | 2,509 | 2,509 | 44,895 | 47,404 |
| Fresno | 51,227 | 1,044,401 | 1,095,628 | 483,778 | 1,579,406 | 49,874 | 1,051,223 | 1,101,097 | 485,518 | 1,586,615 |
| Glenn | - | 74,484 | 74,484 | 247,189 | 321,673 | - | 76,057 | 76,057 | 247,452 | 323,509 |
| Humboldt | 76 | 3,777 | 3,853 | 193,916 | 197,769 | 76 | 3,777 | 3,853 | 193,609 | 197,462 |
| Kern | 48,690 | 882,047 | 930,737 | 784,881 | 1,715,618 | 48,830 | 878,164 | 926,994 | 787,549 | 1,714,543 |
| Kings | 40,003 | 520,056 | 560,059 | 124,661 | 684,720 | 39,929 | 520,256 | 560,185 | 124,801 | 684,986 |
| Lake | - | 5,852 | 5,852 | 42,399 | 48,251 | - | 5,840 | 5,840 | 42,406 | 48,246 |
| Lassen | - | 28,550 | 28,550 | 264,246 | 292,796 | - | 30,956 | 30,956 | 269,681 | 300,637 |
| Madera | 30,202 | 221,757 | 251,959 | 309,007 | 560,966 | 33,378 | 218,518 | 251,896 | 309,337 | 561,233 |
| Marin | 2,638 | 8,693 | 11,331 | 83,086 | 94,417 | 2,590 | 12,098 | 14,688 | 79,417 | 94,105 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | 187,370 | 187,370 | - | - | - | 189,962 | 189,962 |
| Mendocino | - | 29,729 | 29,729 | 445,846 | 475,575 | - | 29,951 | 29,951 | 445,383 | 475,334 |
| Monterey | 3,860 | 62,490 | 66,350 | 647,215 | 713,565 | 3,860 | 64,451 | 68,311 | 650,626 | 718,937 |
| Napa | 6,234 | 8,929 | 15,163 | 49,477 | 64,640 | 6,249 | 9,094 | 15,343 | 50,191 | 65,534 |
| Nevada | - | 5,296 | 5,296 | - | 5,296 | - | 5,296 | 5,296 | - | 5,296 |
| Orange | 2,176 | 929 | 3,105 | 35,798 | 38,903 | 2,173 | 929 | 3,102 | 35,496 | 38,598 |
| Placer | 1,502 | 22,572 | 24,074 | 47,287 | 71,361 | 1,495 | 24,290 | 25,785 | 44,869 | 70,654 |
| Plumas | - | 7,199 | 7,199 | 75,084 | 82,283 | - | 7,199 | 7,199 | 75,771 | 82,970 |
| Riverside | 6,621 | 57,367 | 63,988 | 8,979 | 72,967 | 6,619 | 50,409 | 57,028 | 8,094 | 65,122 |
| Sacramento | 9,820 | 98,140 | 107,960 | 120,322 | 228,282 | 9,069 | 95,930 | 104,999 | 117,908 | 222,907 |
| San Benito | 8,635 | 46,844 | 55,479 | 526,315 | 581,794 | 8,450 | 46,824 | 55,274 | 527,172 | 582,446 |
| San Bernardino | 9,231 | 2,652 | 11,883 | 9,132 | 21,015 | 9,130 | 2,652 | 11,782 | 9,132 | 20,914 |
| San Diego | 2,741 | 10,905 | 13,646 | 90,501 | 104,147 | 2,729 | 10,640 | 13,369 | 89,090 | 102,459 |
| San Joaquin | 133,379 | 260,006 | 393,385 | 167,171 | 560,556 | 131,573 | 261,223 | 392,796 | 166,500 | 559,296 |
| San Luis Obispo | 7,647 | 68,395 | 76,042 | 679,153 | 755,195 | 5,555 | 68,759 | 74,314 | 681,825 | 756,139 |
| San Mateo | 209 | 2,742 | 2,951 | 43,754 | 46,705 | 209 | 2,742 | 2,951 | 43,754 | 46,705 |
| Santa Barbara | 31,746 | 36,349 | 68,095 | 471,810 | 539,905 | 31,383 | 35,785 | 67,168 | 471,230 | 538,398 |

Total Williamson Act Contract Enrollment (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|------------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 11,692 | 25,282 | 36,974 | 338,381 | 375,355 | 11,674 | 2,657 | 14,331 | 337,701 | 352,032 |
| Santa Cruz | 1,283 | 1,419 | 2,702 | 15,321 | 18,023 | 1,283 | 1,419 | 2,702 | 15,112 | 17,814 |
| Shasta | 403 | 14,619 | 15,022 | 143,811 | 158,833 | 403 | 14,740 | 15,143 | 142,522 | 157,665 |
| Sierra | - | 1,953 | 1,953 | 35,269 | 37,222 | - | 1,953 | 1,953 | 35,155 | 37,108 |
| Siskiyou | - | 87,593 | 87,593 | 295,225 | 382,818 | - | 87,853 | 87,853 | 295,879 | 383,732 |
| Solano | 30,970 | 93,478 | 124,448 | 152,207 | 276,655 | 30,968 | 92,318 | 123,286 | 152,156 | 275,442 |
| Sonoma | 4,808 | 24,311 | 29,119 | 253,584 | 282,703 | 4,665 | 24,254 | 28,919 | 251,987 | 280,906 |
| Stanislaus | 84,199 | 214,526 | 298,725 | 415,426 | 714,151 | 84,155 | 214,628 | 298,783 | 410,326 | 709,110 |
| Tehama | - | 53,370 | 53,370 | 750,609 | 803,979 | - | 53,591 | 53,591 | 738,709 | 792,300 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | 22,269 | 22,269 | - | - | - | 22,269 | 22,269 |
| Tulare | - | 606,494 | 606,494 | 514,452 | 1,120,946 | - | 606,786 | 606,786 | 516,734 | 1,123,520 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | 124,093 | 124,093 | - | - | - | 123,738 | 123,738 |
| Ventura | 33,160 | 15,410 | 48,570 | 95,588 | 144,158 | 32,576 | 15,258 | 47,834 | 93,086 | 140,920 |
| Yolo | 83,014 | 210,388 | 293,402 | 184,128 | 477,530 | 82,650 | 209,731 | 292,381 | 183,765 | 476,146 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | 607 | - | 607 | 15 | 622 | 446 | - | 446 | 4 | 450 |
| Corona | 95 | - | 95 | - | 95 | 55 | - | 55 | - | 55 |
| Fremont | 496 | - | 496 | 4,791 | 5,287 | 496 | - | 496 | 4,208 | 4,704 |
| Hayward | - | - | - | 2,358 | 2,358 | - | - | - | 2,358 | 2,358 |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | 1,992 | 1,992 | - | - | - | 1,992 | 1,992 |
| Newark | 211 | - | 211 | 3,059 | 3,270 | 211 | - | 211 | 3,013 | 3,224 |
| Oceanside | 693 | - | 693 | 72 | 765 | 693 | - | 693 | 72 | 765 |
| Palo Alto | 149 | - | 149 | 317 | 466 | 149 | - | 149 | 317 | 466 |
| Perris | 810 | - | 810 | - | 810 | 810 | - | 810 | - | 810 |
| Redlands | 271 | - | 271 | - | 271 | 266 | - | 266 | - | 266 |
| San Jose | 303 | 318 | 621 | 5,089 | 5,710 | 243 | 318 | 561 | 4,705 | 5,266 |
| Saratoga | 30 | - | 30 | 186 | 216 | 30 | - | 30 | 121 | 151 |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | 298 | 298 | - | - | - | 298 | 298 |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 669,154 | 5,000,931 | 5,670,085 | 10,219,847 | 15,889,932 | 664,193 | 4,980,736 | 5,644,929 | 10,202,752 | 15,847,681 |
| Cities | 3,665 | 318 | 3,983 | 18,177 | 22,160 | 3,399 | 318 | 3,717 | 17,088 | 20,805 |
| Grand Totals | 672,819 | 5,001,249 | 5,674,068 | 10,238,024 | 15,912,092 | 667,592 | 4,981,054 | 5,648,646 | 10,219,840 | 15,868,486 |

Table A.1

New Williamson Act Contract Enrollments

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | - | 1 | 1 | 296 | 297 | - | - | - | 160 | 160 |
| Amador | - | - | - | 284 | 284 | - | - | - | 255 | 255 |
| Butte | - | 334 | 334 | - | 334 | 106 | 567 | 673 | 52 | 725 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | 72 | 72 | - | - | - | 47 | 47 |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | 16 | 16 | 84 | 100 | - | 40 | 40 | - | 40 |
| Fresno | - | 2,402 | 2,402 | 244 | 2,646 | - | 3,256 | 3,256 | 7,155 | 10,411 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,864 | 1,864 | - | 1,864 |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | 700 | 700 | - | - | - | 105 | 105 |
| Kern | 118 | 2,009 | 2,127 | 3,403 | 5,530 | 460 | 1,630 | 2,090 | 2,894 | 4,984 |
| Kings | - | 736 | 736 | - | 736 | - | 251 | 251 | 140 | 391 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen | - | 2,582 | 2,582 | 2,876 | 5,458 | - | 2,406 | 2,406 | 5,435 | 7,841 |
| Madera | 787 | 292 | 1,079 | 4,778 | 5,857 | 133 | 101 | 234 | 480 | 714 |
| Marin | - | - | - | 679 | 679 | - | 224 | 224 | - | 224 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | 7,372 | 7,372 | - | - | - | 2,608 | 2,608 |
| Mendocino | - | 50 | 50 | 1,452 | 1,502 | - | 222 | 222 | 418 | 640 |
| Monterey | - | 265 | 265 | 14,290 | 14,555 | - | 2,090 | 2,090 | 3,366 | 5,456 |
| Napa | 374 | 126 | 500 | 2,477 | 2,977 | 15 | 165 | 180 | 714 | 894 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Placer | - | 40 | 40 | 135 | 175 | - | 63 | 63 | 18 | 81 |
| Plumas | - | 80 | 80 | - | 80 | - | - | - | 687 | 687 |
| Riverside | - | - | - | - | - | - | 467 | 467 | - | 467 |
| Sacramento | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 3 | 15 | 18 |
| San Benito | - | 67 | 67 | 25 | 92 | - | - | - | 1,071 | 1,071 |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Joaquin | 99 | 732 | 831 | - | 831 | 351 | 1,004 | 1,355 | 49 | 1,404 |
| San Luis Obispo | 33 | 153 | 186 | 2,984 | 3,170 | 40 | 313 | 353 | 6,933 | 7,286 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | - | 103 | 103 | 101 | 204 | - | - | - | - | - |

New Williamson Act Contract Enrollments (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 40 | 14 | 54 | 676 | 730 | 52 | - | 52 | 716 | 768 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shasta | - | 420 | 420 | 1,981 | 2,401 | - | 121 | 121 | 2,199 | 2,320 |
| Sierra | - | - | - | 13 | 13 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | 112 | 112 | 167 | 279 | - | 260 | 260 | 654 | 914 |
| Solano | - | 972 | 972 | 2,203 | 3,175 | - | 9 | 9 | 19 | 28 |
| Sonoma | - | 18 | 18 | 1,406 | 1,424 | - | 24 | 24 | 283 | 307 |
| Stanislaus | 273 | 622 | 895 | 1,027 | 1,922 | 230 | 487 | 717 | 9 | 726 |
| Tehama | - | 107 | 107 | 833 | 940 | - | 429 | 429 | 3,163 | 3,592 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 534 | 534 | 1,467 | 2,001 | - | 951 | 951 | 2,422 | 3,373 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura | 70 | 192 | 262 | 1,770 | 2,032 | 318 | 112 | 430 | 20 | 450 |
| Yolo | - | 15 | 15 | - | 15 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Corona | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fremont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | 15 |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Jose | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 1,794 | 12,994 | 14,788 | 53,795 | 68,583 | 1,705 | 17,059 | 18,764 | 42,087 | 60,851 |
| Cities | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | 15 |
| Grand Totals | 1,794 | 12,994 | 14,788 | 53,795 | 68,583 | 1,705 | 17,059 | 18,764 | 42,102 | 60,866 |

Table A.2

Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Initiated

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | 32 | - | 32 | - | 32 | 102 | - | 102 | 278 | 380 |
| Amador | - | - | - | 40 | 40 | - | - | - | 97 | 97 |
| Butte | - | 1,489 | 1,489 | 158 | 1,647 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | 144 | 144 | - | - | - | 680 | 680 |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | 10 | 10 | 136 | 146 | - | - | - | 4,484 | 4,484 |
| Fresno | 118 | 251 | 369 | 202 | 571 | 74 | 254 | 328 | 844 | 1,172 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | 234 | 234 | 73 | 307 |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kern | 160 | - | 160 | - | 160 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kings | 82 | 1,467 | 1,549 | - | 1,549 | 76 | 1,323 | 1,399 | - | 1,399 |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen | - | - | - | 113 | 113 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | - | - | 2,011 | 2,011 | 183 | 116 | 299 | 132 | 431 |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | 290 | 290 | 39 | 329 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | 126 | 126 | 29 | 155 |
| Napa | - | - | - | - | - | - | 18 | 18 | - | 18 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Placer | - | 189 | 189 | 45 | 234 | - | 278 | 278 | 458 | 736 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | 39 | 330 | 369 | 3 | 372 | 27 | 101 | 128 | - | 128 |
| Sacramento | - | 578 | 578 | 422 | 1,000 | - | 141 | 141 | 363 | 504 |
| San Benito | - | 55 | 55 | 698 | 753 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino | 14 | - | 14 | - | 14 | 37 | - | 37 | 240 | 277 |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Joaquin | 554 | 344 | 898 | 1,178 | 2,076 | 1,022 | 1,497 | 2,519 | 191 | 2,710 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | 22 | 22 | 688 | 710 | - | 24 | 24 | 29 | 53 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | - | - | - | 7 | - | 7 | - | 7 |

Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Initiated (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 20 | - | 20 | 327 | 347 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 292 | 292 |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58 | 58 | - | 58 |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | 337 | 337 | 499 | 836 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano | - | 39 | 39 | - | 39 | - | 67 | 67 | - | 67 |
| Sonoma | 132 | 210 | 342 | 1,426 | 1,768 | - | - | - | 51 | 51 |
| Stanislaus | 79 | 99 | 178 | 5,092 | 5,270 | 41 | - | 41 | - | 41 |
| Tehama | - | 20 | 20 | 1,730 | 1,750 | - | 76 | 76 | 50 | 126 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 317 | 317 | 280 | 597 | - | 146 | 146 | 14 | 160 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | 77 | 77 | - | - | - | 324 | 324 |
| Ventura | 6 | - | 6 | 152 | 158 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yolo | 580 | 78 | 658 | 40 | 698 | 702 | 514 | 1,216 | 727 | 1,943 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Corona | 10 | - | 10 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fremont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | 17 | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Jose | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 157 | 157 |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 1,816 | 5,835 | 7,651 | 15,461 | 23,112 | 2,272 | 5,263 | 7,535 | 9,395 | 16,929 |
| Cities | 27 | - | 27 | - | 27 | - | - | - | 157 | 157 |
| Grand Totals | 1,843 | 5,835 | 7,678 | 15,461 | 23,139 | 2,272 | 5,263 | 7,535 | 9,552 | 17,086 |

Table A.3

Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Expired

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | 210 | - | 210 | 725 | 935 | 145 | 299 | 444 | 307 | 750 |
| Amador | - | - | - | 114 | 114 | - | - | - | 51 | 51 |
| Butte | 88 | - | 88 | 196 | 284 | - | - | - | 213 | 213 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | 239 | 239 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | 174 | 174 | - | - | - | 1,911 | 1,911 |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | 15 | 15 | - | 5 | 5 | 564 | 569 |
| Fresno | 72 | - | 72 | - | 72 | 391 | 41 | 432 | 50 | 482 |
| Glenn | - | 367 | 367 | - | 367 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 412 | 412 |
| Kern | 3,975 | 6,855 | 10,830 | 4,250 | 15,080 | 320 | 2,494 | 2,814 | 79 | 2,893 |
| Kings | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lake | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen | - | - | - | 755 | 755 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | - | - | 499 | 499 | - | - | - | 80 | 80 |
| Marin | - | - | - | 49 | 49 | - | - | - | 96 | 96 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | 39 | 39 | - | - | - | 881 | 881 |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | 148 | 148 | - | 148 |
| Napa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | 493 | - | 493 | 3,690 | 4,183 | - | - | - | 91 | 91 |
| Placer | - | 91 | 91 | 201 | 292 | - | - | - | 788 | 788 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | 219 | 280 | 499 | 52 | 551 | 11 | 1,465 | 1,476 | 100 | 1,576 |
| Sacramento | - | 711 | 711 | 180 | 891 | - | 610 | 610 | 1,414 | 2,024 |
| San Benito | 161 | - | 161 | 437 | 598 | 78 | 18 | 96 | 217 | 313 |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | 101 | - | 101 | - | 101 |
| San Diego | 23 | 82 | 105 | 82 | 187 | 12 | 265 | 277 | 74 | 351 |
| San Joaquin | 166 | 154 | 320 | 10 | 330 | 1,323 | 143 | 1,466 | 45 | 1,511 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | 1,172 | 1,172 | 6,580 | 7,752 | 2,162 | 111 | 2,273 | 3,269 | 5,542 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | 21 | - | 21 | 28 | 49 | 363 | 564 | 927 | 580 | 1,507 |

Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals Expired (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|-------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 199 | - | 199 | - | 199 | 58 | 16 | 74 | 423 | 497 |
| Santa Cruz | - | 65 | 65 | 122 | 187 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | 646 | 646 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano | 106 | 88 | 194 | 387 | 581 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sonoma | 451 | 975 | 1,426 | 4,788 | 6,214 | 162 | 7 | 169 | 1,178 | 1,347 |
| Stanislaus | 49 | - | 49 | - | 49 | 226 | 296 | 522 | 9 | 532 |
| Tehama | - | 139 | 139 | 410 | 549 | - | 208 | 208 | 4,053 | 4,261 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 9 | 9 | 60 | 69 | - | 44 | 44 | 199 | 243 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | 331 | 331 | - | - | - | 406 | 406 |
| Ventura | 879 | 326 | 1,205 | 2,692 | 3,897 | 1,112 | 46 | 1,158 | 2,512 | 3,670 |
| Yolo | - | - | - | - | - | 197 | 516 | 713 | 339 | 1,052 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | 112 | - | 112 | - | 112 |
| Corona | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | - | 20 | - | 20 |
| Fremont | - | - | - | 186 | 186 | - | - | - | 477 | 477 |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | 19 | - | 19 | - | 19 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Jose | - | - | - | - | - | 60 | - | 60 | 384 | 444 |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 53 | 53 |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 7,112 | 11,314 | 18,426 | 27,756 | 46,182 | 6,661 | 7,296 | 13,957 | 20,341 | 34,298 |
| Cities | 19 | - | 19 | 186 | 205 | 192 | - | 192 | 914 | 1,106 |
| Grand Totals | 7,131 | 11,314 | 18,445 | 27,942 | 46,387 | 6,853 | 7,296 | 14,149 | 21,255 | 35,404 |

Table A.4

Cumulative Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | 2,009 | 1,983 | 3,992 | 13,037 | 17,029 | 1,938 | 1,684 | 3,622 | 12,086 | 15,708 |
| Amador | - | 90 | 90 | 4,644 | 4,734 | - | 90 | 90 | 4,690 | 4,780 |
| Butte | 118 | 2,428 | 2,546 | 4,291 | 6,837 | 117 | 2,428 | 2,545 | 4,078 | 6,623 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | 8,739 | 8,739 | - | - | - | 9,414 | 9,414 |
| Colusa | - | - | - | 14,965 | 14,965 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | 2,251 | 781 | 3,032 | 11,816 | 14,848 | 2,132 | 568 | 2,700 | 8,828 | 11,528 |
| El Dorado | - | 524 | 524 | 7,921 | 8,445 | - | 508 | 508 | 11,587 | 12,095 |
| Fresno | 2,723 | 2,798 | 5,521 | 2,742 | 8,263 | 2,413 | 3,073 | 5,486 | 3,463 | 8,949 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | 681 | 681 | - | 234 | 234 | 702 | 936 |
| Humboldt | - | 75 | 75 | 2,060 | 2,135 | - | 75 | 75 | 1,648 | 1,723 |
| Kern | 10,297 | 54,990 | 65,287 | 15,819 | 81,106 | 9,977 | 52,496 | 62,473 | 15,740 | 78,213 |
| Kings | 353 | 2,257 | 2,610 | 1,508 | 4,118 | 429 | 3,580 | 4,009 | 1,508 | 5,517 |
| Lake | - | 21 | 21 | 379 | 400 | - | 21 | 21 | 379 | 400 |
| Lassen | - | - | - | 113 | 113 | - | - | - | 113 | 113 |
| Madera | 3,495 | 11,846 | 15,341 | 11,367 | 26,708 | 3,678 | 11,964 | 15,642 | 11,419 | 27,061 |
| Marin | 10 | 10 | 20 | 1,002 | 1,022 | 10 | 300 | 310 | 945 | 1,255 |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | 329 | 329 | - | - | - | 329 | 329 |
| Mendocino | - | 871 | 871 | 21,042 | 21,913 | - | 871 | 871 | 20,161 | 21,032 |
| Monterey | 576 | 1,073 | 1,649 | 8,301 | 9,950 | 576 | 1,019 | 1,595 | 8,362 | 9,957 |
| Napa | 115 | 132 | 247 | 354 | 601 | 115 | 150 | 265 | 354 | 619 |
| Nevada | - | 1,956 | 1,956 | - | 1,956 | - | 1,946 | 1,946 | - | 1,946 |
| Orange | 2,166 | 299 | 2,465 | 23,399 | 25,864 | 2,163 | 299 | 2,462 | 23,097 | 25,559 |
| Placer | 1,065 | 9,637 | 10,702 | 17,918 | 28,620 | 1,065 | 10,201 | 11,266 | 16,980 | 28,246 |
| Plumas | - | 6 | 6 | 5,758 | 5,764 | - | 6 | 6 | 5,758 | 5,764 |
| Riverside | 3,931 | 16,996 | 20,927 | 3,278 | 24,205 | 3,947 | 9,943 | 13,890 | 2,422 | 16,312 |
| Sacramento | 3,964 | 11,753 | 15,717 | 29,891 | 45,608 | 3,964 | 11,284 | 15,248 | 28,840 | 44,088 |
| San Benito | 3,275 | 2,776 | 6,051 | 13,061 | 19,112 | 3,090 | 2,672 | 5,762 | 12,687 | 18,449 |
| San Bernardino | 3,465 | 206 | 3,671 | 3,078 | 6,749 | 3,401 | 206 | 3,607 | 3,318 | 6,925 |
| San Diego | 1,055 | 6,731 | 7,786 | 2,820 | 10,606 | 1,043 | 6,466 | 7,509 | 2,746 | 10,255 |
| San Joaquin | 13,782 | 8,443 | 22,225 | 6,084 | 28,309 | 12,392 | 9,432 | 21,824 | 6,227 | 28,051 |
| San Luis Obispo | 2,175 | 1,847 | 4,022 | 11,253 | 15,275 | 13 | 1,760 | 1,773 | 8,013 | 9,786 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | 181 | 181 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | 875 | 1,376 | 2,251 | 4,815 | 7,066 | 519 | 812 | 1,331 | 4,235 | 5,566 |

Cumulative Williamson Act Contract Nonrenewals (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 2,653 | 307 | 2,960 | 21,628 | 24,588 | 2,551 | 291 | 2,842 | 21,205 | 24,047 |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 292 | 292 |
| Shasta | 98 | 152 | 250 | 2,083 | 2,333 | 98 | 210 | 308 | 2,083 | 2,391 |
| Sierra | - | - | - | 425 | 425 | - | - | - | 352 | 352 |
| Siskiyou | - | 470 | 470 | 1,166 | 1,636 | - | 470 | 470 | 1,166 | 1,636 |
| Solano | 5,748 | 2,853 | 8,601 | 12,538 | 21,139 | 5,748 | 2,930 | 8,678 | 12,538 | 21,216 |
| Sonoma | 162 | 210 | 372 | 6,333 | 6,705 | - | 203 | 203 | 5,206 | 5,409 |
| Stanislaus | 3,753 | 16,131 | 19,884 | 35,558 | 55,442 | 3,568 | 15,835 | 19,403 | 35,549 | 54,952 |
| Tehama | - | 801 | 801 | 10,591 | 11,392 | - | 669 | 669 | 6,588 | 7,257 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 3,235 | 3,235 | 6,903 | 10,138 | - | 3,282 | 3,282 | 6,982 | 10,264 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | 11,766 | 11,766 | - | - | - | 7,957 | 7,957 |
| Ventura | 5,845 | 863 | 6,708 | 18,449 | 25,157 | 4,733 | 818 | 5,551 | 15,937 | 21,488 |
| Yolo | 12,274 | 11,446 | 23,720 | 21,182 | 44,902 | 12,779 | 11,337 | 24,116 | 21,570 | 45,686 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | 485 | - | 485 | - | 485 | 373 | - | 373 | - | 373 |
| Corona | 58 | - | 58 | - | 58 | 38 | - | 38 | - | 38 |
| Fremont | 396 | - | 396 | 804 | 1,200 | 396 | - | 396 | 327 | 723 |
| Hayward | - | - | - | 1,989 | 1,989 | - | - | - | 1,989 | 1,989 |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oceanside | 349 | - | 349 | 47 | 396 | 349 | - | 349 | 47 | 396 |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | 93 | - | 93 | - | 93 | 93 | - | 93 | - | 93 |
| San Jose | 142 | - | 142 | 490 | 632 | 82 | - | 82 | 263 | 345 |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | 111 | 111 | - | - | - | 46 | 46 |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | 188 | 188 | - | - | - | 188 | 188 |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 88,233 | 178,373 | 266,606 | 401,268 | 667,874 | 82,459 | 170,133 | 252,592 | 367,553 | 620,145 |
| Cities | 1,523 | - | 1,523 | 3,629 | 5,152 | 1,331 | - | 1,331 | 2,860 | 4,191 |
| Grand Totals | 89,756 | 178,373 | 268,129 | 404,897 | 673,026 | 83,790 | 170,133 | 253,923 | 370,413 | 624,336 |

Table A.5

Cancellations of Williamson Act Contract

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fresno | 45 | 26 | 71 | 5 | 76 | 3 | 16 | 19 | 3 | 22 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kern | - | 28 | 28 | - | 28 | - | 10 | 10 | - | 10 |
| Kings | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lake | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | - | - | - | - | - | 248 | 248 | - | 248 |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Napa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Placer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sacramento | - | 10 | 10 | 3 | 13 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Joaquin | 10 | - | 10 | - | 10 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 56 | 56 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Cancellations of Williamson Act Contract (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 209 | 209 |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sonoma | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stanislaus | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5,068 | 5,068 |
| Tehama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 18 | 18 | - | 18 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yolo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Corona | 10 | - | 10 | - | 10 | 20 | - | 20 | - | 20 |
| Fremont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 61 | 61 |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Redlands | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Jose | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 55 | 82 | 137 | 8 | 145 | 3 | 274 | 277 | 5,336 | 5,613 |
| Cities | 10 | - | 10 | - | 10 | 20 | - | 20 | 61 | 81 |
| Grand Totals | 65 | 82 | 147 | 8 | 155 | 23 | 274 | 297 | 5,397 | 5,694 |

Table A.6

Public Acquisitions of Williamson Act Contracted Land

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | 369 | 897 | 1,266 | 1,122 | 2,388 | 48 | 43 | 91 | 1,150 | 1,240 |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte | - | - | - | 3,373 | 3,373 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | 210 | 60 | 270 | 360 | 630 | 111 | 4 | 115 | 444 | 559 |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | 4 | 4 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Fresno | 928 | 442 | 1,370 | 1,773 | 3,143 | 250 | 93 | 343 | 1,204 | 1,547 |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kern | 130 | 909 | 1,039 | 330 | 1,369 | - | 3,009 | 3,009 | 147 | 3,156 |
| Kings | 68 | 52 | 120 | - | 120 | 74 | 52 | 126 | - | 126 |
| Lake | - | 33 | 33 | 763 | 796 | - | 5 | 5 | - | 5 |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | - | 32 | 32 | 1 | 33 | - | - | - | 119 | 119 |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Napa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | 3 | 211 | 214 |
| Placer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | - | 799 | 799 | 29 | 828 | - | 5,972 | 5,972 | 757 | 6,729 |
| Sacramento | - | 1,176 | 1,176 | 1,034 | 2,210 | 751 | 1,901 | 2,652 | 1,015 | 3,667 |
| San Benito | 111 | - | 111 | 1,632 | 1,743 | 107 | 1 | 108 | 4 | 112 |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,337 | 1,337 |
| San Joaquin | 211 | 94 | 305 | 798 | 1,103 | 1,150 | - | 1,150 | 3 | 1,153 |
| San Luis Obispo | - | 5 | 5 | 17 | 22 | - | 2 | 2 | 740 | 742 |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Public Acquisitions of Williamson Act Contracted Land (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------|-------|------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|------------------|--------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 7 | - | 7 | 11,257 | 11,264 | 11 | - | 11 | 904 | 915 |
| Santa Cruz | 10 | 162 | 172 | 3,654 | 3,826 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Solano | 2 | 4 | 6 | 494 | 500 | 2 | 1,179 | 1,181 | 58 | 1,239 |
| Sonoma | - | - | - | 318 | 318 | - | - | - | 688 | 688 |
| Stanislaus | 16 | 122 | 138 | 25 | 163 | 79 | - | 79 | - | 79 |
| Tehama | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11,010 | 11,010 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | - | - | - | - | - | 149 | 149 | 322 | 471 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | 6 | 6 | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Ventura | 2 | 38 | 40 | 1,617 | 1,657 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| Yolo | 104 | 4 | 108 | - | 108 | 167 | 141 | 308 | 27 | 335 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | 49 | - | 49 | 11 | 60 |
| Corona | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fremont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | 5 | - | 5 |
| San Jose | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 2,168 | 4,829 | 6,997 | 28,607 | 35,604 | 2,756 | 12,554 | 15,310 | 20,147 | 35,456 |
| Cities | - | - | - | 5 | 5 | 54 | - | 54 | 11 | 65 |
| Grand Totals | 2,168 | 4,829 | 6,997 | 28,612 | 35,609 | 2,810 | 12,554 | 15,364 | 20,158 | 35,521 |

Table A.7

Williamson Act Contracted Land not Receiving Tax Relief Benefits*

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | - | 1,798 | 1,798 | 13,292 | 15,090 | - | 1,798 | 1,798 | 13,439 | 15,237 |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butte | 3,606 | 39,422 | 43,028 | 243 | 43,271 | 2,225 | 41,114 | 43,339 | 760 | 44,099 |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Contra Costa | - | 3,880 | 3,880 | 2,030 | 5,910 | - | 3,917 | 3,917 | 2,320 | 6,237 |
| El Dorado | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fresno | 66 | 6,052 | 6,118 | 112 | 6,230 | 194 | 16,958 | 17,152 | 200 | 17,352 |
| Glenn | - | 5,693 | 5,693 | 2,483 | 8,176 | - | 5,120 | 5,120 | 2,883 | 8,003 |
| Humboldt | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kern | 763 | 6,460 | 7,223 | 4,269 | 11,492 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kings | 3,889 | 149,983 | 153,872 | 5,242 | 159,114 | 3,385 | 142,488 | 145,873 | 5,379 | 151,252 |
| Lake | - | 312 | 312 | 3 | 315 | - | 312 | 312 | 3 | 315 |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Madera | 7,295 | 31,814 | 39,109 | 3,037 | 42,146 | 8,635 | 31,216 | 39,851 | 3,924 | 43,775 |
| Marin | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | 247 | 247 | - | - | - | 247 | 247 |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monterey | 317 | 11,683 | 12,000 | 1,780 | 13,780 | 245 | 8,582 | 8,827 | 1,376 | 10,203 |
| Napa | 1,452 | 3,494 | 4,946 | 3,979 | 8,925 | 1,603 | 4,075 | 5,678 | 4,678 | 10,356 |
| Nevada | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Orange | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Placer | - | 845 | 845 | 178 | 1,023 | - | 1,504 | 1,504 | 270 | 1,774 |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Riverside | - | 1,487 | 1,487 | 11 | 1,498 | 18 | 758 | 776 | 9 | 785 |
| Sacramento | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Benito | 1,409 | 638 | 2,047 | 69 | 2,116 | 1,772 | 695 | 2,467 | 164 | 2,631 |
| San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Joaquin | 1,279 | 3,864 | 5,143 | 11,917 | 17,060 | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Mateo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Barbara | 7,883 | 3,083 | 10,966 | 987 | 11,953 | 7,779 | 1,528 | 9,307 | 888 | 10,195 |

Williamson Act Contracted Land not Receiving Tax Relief Benefits* (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | 10 | - | 10 | 645 | 655 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Santa Cruz | 354 | 190 | 544 | 1,346 | 1,890 | 466 | 190 | 656 | 1,569 | 2,225 |
| Shasta | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | - | - | - | - | - | 35 | 35 | 80 | 115 |
| Solano | 286 | 1,722 | 2,008 | 1,582 | 3,590 | 294 | 929 | 1,223 | 1,584 | 2,807 |
| Sonoma | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stanislaus | 1,703 | 8,514 | 10,217 | 1,875 | 12,092 | 1,327 | 5,569 | 6,896 | 1,063 | 7,959 |
| Tehama | - | 5,471 | 5,471 | 1,820 | 7,291 | - | 4,789 | 4,789 | 1,298 | 6,087 |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tulare | - | 69,202 | 69,202 | 5,618 | 74,820 | - | 73,923 | 73,923 | 4,109 | 78,032 |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ventura | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Yolo | 5,064 | 11,501 | 16,565 | 3,400 | 19,965 | 6,219 | 10,714 | 16,933 | 3,903 | 20,836 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Corona | 36 | - | 36 | - | 36 | 36 | - | 36 | - | 36 |
| Fremont | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 24 | 24 |
| Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Menlo Park | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Newark | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oceanside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Palo Alto | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Perris | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| RedLands | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| San Jose | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Saratoga | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Thousand Oaks | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | 35,376 | 367,108 | 402,484 | 66,166 | 468,650 | 34,162 | 356,214 | 390,376 | 50,146 | 440,522 |
| Cities | 36 | - | 36 | - | 36 | 36 | - | 36 | 24 | 60 |
| Grand Totals | 35,412 | 367,108 | 402,520 | 66,166 | 468,686 | 34,198 | 356,214 | 390,412 | 50,170 | 440,582 |

Table A.8

*The land was assessed at a lower value for property taxes under Revenue and Taxation Code Section 110.1 (Proposition 13 provisions) than under Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 423, 423.3, or 423.5 (Williamson Act valuation provisions).

Amounts Paid Under the Open Space Subvention Act

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda | \$ 17,270 | \$ 29,985 | \$ 47,255 | \$ 113,573 | \$ 160,828 | \$ 15,990 | \$ 29,772 | \$ 45,762 | \$ 113,233 | \$ 158,995 |
| Amador | \$ - | \$ 21,940 | \$ 21,940 | \$ 85,392 | \$ 107,332 | \$ - | \$ 21,940 | \$ 21,940 | \$ 85,550 | \$ 107,490 |
| Butte | \$ 47,790 | \$ 255,700 | \$ 303,490 | \$ 98,944 | \$ 402,434 | \$ 55,230 | \$ 250,075 | \$ 305,305 | \$ 98,479 | \$ 403,784 |
| Calaveras | \$ - | \$ 67,705 | \$ 67,705 | \$ 111,515 | \$ 179,220 | \$ - | \$ 67,705 | \$ 67,705 | \$ 110,887 | \$ 178,592 |
| Colusa | \$ - | \$ 51,725 | \$ 51,725 | \$ 175,482 | \$ 227,207 | \$ - | \$ 51,725 | \$ 51,725 | \$ 190,447 | \$ 242,172 |
| Contra Costa | \$ 9,960 | \$ 19,795 | \$ 29,755 | \$ 37,394 | \$ 67,149 | \$ 9,960 | \$ 20,665 | \$ 30,625 | \$ 37,734 | \$ 68,359 |
| El Dorado | \$ - | \$ 8,255 | \$ 8,255 | \$ 37,829 | \$ 46,084 | \$ - | \$ 10,005 | \$ 10,005 | \$ 33,308 | \$ 43,313 |
| Fresno | \$ 242,190 | \$ 5,177,755 | \$ 5,419,945 | \$ 480,924 | \$ 5,900,869 | \$ 236,335 | \$ 5,155,960 | \$ 5,392,295 | \$ 481,855 | \$ 5,874,150 |
| Glenn | \$ - | \$ 343,955 | \$ 343,955 | \$ 244,025 | \$ 587,980 | \$ - | \$ 353,515 | \$ 353,515 | \$ 243,867 | \$ 597,382 |
| Humboldt | \$ 380 | \$ 18,510 | \$ 18,890 | \$ 191,856 | \$ 210,746 | \$ 380 | \$ 18,510 | \$ 18,890 | \$ 191,961 | \$ 210,851 |
| Kern | \$ 188,150 | \$ 4,102,985 | \$ 4,291,135 | \$ 764,793 | \$ 5,055,928 | \$ 194,265 | \$ 4,128,340 | \$ 4,322,605 | \$ 771,809 | \$ 5,094,414 |
| Kings | \$ 178,805 | \$ 1,839,080 | \$ 2,017,885 | \$ 117,911 | \$ 2,135,796 | \$ 180,575 | \$ 1,870,940 | \$ 2,051,515 | \$ 117,914 | \$ 2,169,429 |
| Lake | \$ - | \$ 27,595 | \$ 27,595 | \$ 42,017 | \$ 69,612 | \$ - | \$ 27,535 | \$ 27,535 | \$ 42,024 | \$ 69,559 |
| Lassen | \$ - | \$ 142,750 | \$ 142,750 | \$ 264,133 | \$ 406,883 | \$ - | \$ 154,782 | \$ 154,782 | \$ 269,568 | \$ 424,350 |
| Madera | \$ 97,060 | \$ 890,485 | \$ 987,545 | \$ 294,603 | \$ 1,282,148 | \$ 105,325 | \$ 876,690 | \$ 982,015 | \$ 293,994 | \$ 1,276,009 |
| Marin | \$ 13,140 | \$ 43,415 | \$ 56,555 | \$ 82,084 | \$ 138,639 | \$ 12,900 | \$ 58,990 | \$ 71,890 | \$ 78,472 | \$ 150,362 |
| Mariposa | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 186,794 | \$ 186,794 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 189,386 | \$ 189,386 |
| Mendocino | \$ - | \$ 144,290 | \$ 144,290 | \$ 424,804 | \$ 569,094 | \$ - | \$ 145,400 | \$ 145,400 | \$ 425,222 | \$ 570,622 |
| Monterey | \$ 14,835 | \$ 248,670 | \$ 263,505 | \$ 637,134 | \$ 900,639 | \$ 15,195 | \$ 274,250 | \$ 289,445 | \$ 640,888 | \$ 930,333 |
| Napa | \$ 23,335 | \$ 26,515 | \$ 49,850 | \$ 45,144 | \$ 94,994 | \$ 22,655 | \$ 24,345 | \$ 47,000 | \$ 45,159 | \$ 92,159 |
| Nevada | \$ - | \$ 16,700 | \$ 16,700 | \$ - | \$ 16,700 | \$ - | \$ 16,750 | \$ 16,750 | \$ - | \$ 16,750 |
| Orange | \$ 50 | \$ 3,150 | \$ 3,200 | \$ 12,399 | \$ 15,599 | \$ 50 | \$ 3,150 | \$ 3,200 | \$ 12,399 | \$ 15,599 |
| Placer | \$ 2,185 | \$ 60,450 | \$ 62,635 | \$ 29,191 | \$ 91,826 | \$ 2,150 | \$ 62,925 | \$ 65,075 | \$ 27,619 | \$ 92,694 |
| Plumas | \$ - | \$ 35,965 | \$ 35,965 | \$ 69,326 | \$ 105,291 | \$ - | \$ 35,965 | \$ 35,965 | \$ 70,013 | \$ 105,978 |
| Riverside | \$ 13,450 | \$ 194,420 | \$ 207,870 | \$ 5,690 | \$ 213,560 | \$ 13,270 | \$ 198,540 | \$ 211,810 | \$ 5,663 | \$ 217,473 |
| Sacramento | \$ 29,280 | \$ 431,935 | \$ 461,215 | \$ 90,431 | \$ 551,646 | \$ 25,525 | \$ 423,230 | \$ 448,755 | \$ 89,068 | \$ 537,823 |
| San Benito | \$ 19,755 | \$ 217,150 | \$ 236,905 | \$ 513,185 | \$ 750,090 | \$ 17,940 | \$ 217,285 | \$ 235,225 | \$ 514,321 | \$ 749,546 |
| San Bernardino | \$ 28,830 | \$ 12,230 | \$ 41,060 | \$ 6,054 | \$ 47,114 | \$ 28,645 | \$ 12,230 | \$ 40,875 | \$ 5,814 | \$ 46,689 |
| San Diego | \$ 8,430 | \$ 20,870 | \$ 29,300 | \$ 87,681 | \$ 116,981 | \$ 8,430 | \$ 20,870 | \$ 29,300 | \$ 86,344 | \$ 115,644 |
| San Joaquin | \$ 591,590 | \$ 1,238,495 | \$ 1,830,085 | \$ 149,170 | \$ 1,979,255 | \$ 595,905 | \$ 1,258,955 | \$ 1,854,860 | \$ 160,273 | \$ 2,015,133 |
| San Luis Obispo | \$ 27,360 | \$ 332,740 | \$ 360,100 | \$ 667,900 | \$ 1,028,000 | \$ 27,710 | \$ 334,995 | \$ 362,705 | \$ 673,812 | \$ 1,036,517 |
| San Mateo | \$ 1,045 | \$ 13,710 | \$ 14,755 | \$ 43,573 | \$ 58,328 | \$ 1,045 | \$ 13,710 | \$ 14,755 | \$ 43,754 | \$ 58,509 |
| Santa Barbara | \$ 114,940 | \$ 159,450 | \$ 274,390 | \$ 466,008 | \$ 740,398 | \$ 115,425 | \$ 167,225 | \$ 282,650 | \$ 466,107 | \$ 748,757 |

Amounts Paid Under the Open Space Subvention Act (continued)

| Participating Local Jurisdictions | 1993/94 Lien Year | | | | | 1994/95 Lien Year | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL | Prime Land | | | Nonprime Land | TOTAL |
| | Urban | Other | Total | | | Urban | Other | Total | | |
| Counties (continued) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Santa Clara | \$ 45,145 | \$ 124,875 | \$ 170,020 | \$ 316,108 | \$ 486,128 | \$ 45,615 | \$ 11,830 | \$ 57,445 | \$ 316,496 | \$ 373,941 |
| Santa Cruz | \$ 4,645 | \$ 6,145 | \$ 10,790 | \$ 13,975 | \$ 24,765 | \$ 4,085 | \$ 6,145 | \$ 10,230 | \$ 13,251 | \$ 23,481 |
| Shasta | \$ 1,525 | \$ 72,335 | \$ 73,860 | \$ 141,728 | \$ 215,588 | \$ 1,525 | \$ 72,650 | \$ 74,175 | \$ 140,439 | \$ 214,614 |
| Sierra | \$ - | \$ 9,765 | \$ 9,765 | \$ 34,844 | \$ 44,609 | \$ - | \$ 9,765 | \$ 9,765 | \$ 34,803 | \$ 44,568 |
| Siskiyou | \$ - | \$ 435,615 | \$ 435,615 | \$ 294,059 | \$ 729,674 | \$ - | \$ 436,740 | \$ 436,740 | \$ 294,633 | \$ 731,373 |
| Solano | \$ 124,680 | \$ 444,515 | \$ 569,195 | \$ 138,087 | \$ 707,282 | \$ 124,630 | \$ 442,295 | \$ 566,925 | \$ 138,034 | \$ 704,959 |
| Sonoma | \$ 23,230 | \$ 120,505 | \$ 143,735 | \$ 247,250 | \$ 390,985 | \$ 23,325 | \$ 120,255 | \$ 143,580 | \$ 246,781 | \$ 390,361 |
| Stanislaus | \$ 393,715 | \$ 949,405 | \$ 1,343,120 | \$ 377,993 | \$ 1,721,113 | \$ 396,301 | \$ 966,120 | \$ 1,362,421 | \$ 373,715 | \$ 1,736,135 |
| Tehama | \$ - | \$ 235,490 | \$ 235,490 | \$ 738,198 | \$ 973,688 | \$ - | \$ 240,665 | \$ 240,665 | \$ 730,823 | \$ 971,488 |
| Trinity | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 22,269 | \$ 22,269 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 22,269 | \$ 22,269 |
| Tulare | \$ - | \$ 2,670,285 | \$ 2,670,285 | \$ 501,931 | \$ 3,172,216 | \$ - | \$ 2,647,905 | \$ 2,647,905 | \$ 505,643 | \$ 3,153,548 |
| Tuolumne | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 112,327 | \$ 112,327 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 115,781 | \$ 115,781 |
| Ventura | \$ 136,575 | \$ 72,735 | \$ 209,310 | \$ 77,139 | \$ 286,449 | \$ 139,215 | \$ 72,200 | \$ 211,415 | \$ 77,149 | \$ 288,564 |
| Yolo | \$ 328,380 | \$ 937,205 | \$ 1,265,585 | \$ 159,546 | \$ 1,425,131 | \$ 318,260 | \$ 938,400 | \$ 1,256,660 | \$ 158,292 | \$ 1,414,952 |
| Cities | | | | | | | | | | |
| Camarillo | \$ 610 | \$ - | \$ 610 | \$ 15 | \$ 625 | \$ 365 | \$ - | \$ 365 | \$ 4 | \$ 369 |
| Corona | \$ 5 | \$ - | \$ 5 | \$ - | \$ 5 | \$ (95) | \$ - | \$ (95) | \$ - | \$ (95) |
| Fremont | \$ 500 | \$ - | \$ 500 | \$ 3,987 | \$ 4,487 | \$ 500 | \$ - | \$ 500 | \$ 3,857 | \$ 4,357 |
| Hayward | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 369 | \$ 369 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 369 | \$ 369 |
| Menlo Park | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,992 | \$ 1,992 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 1,992 | \$ 1,992 |
| Newark | \$ 1,055 | \$ - | \$ 1,055 | \$ 3,059 | \$ 4,114 | \$ 1,055 | \$ - | \$ 1,055 | \$ 3,013 | \$ 4,068 |
| Oceanside | \$ 1,720 | \$ - | \$ 1,720 | \$ 25 | \$ 1,745 | \$ 1,720 | \$ - | \$ 1,720 | \$ 25 | \$ 1,745 |
| Palo Alto | \$ 745 | \$ - | \$ 745 | \$ 317 | \$ 1,062 | \$ 745 | \$ - | \$ 745 | \$ 317 | \$ 1,062 |
| Perris | \$ 4,050 | \$ - | \$ 4,050 | \$ - | \$ 4,050 | \$ 4,050 | \$ - | \$ 4,050 | \$ - | \$ 4,050 |
| RedLands | \$ 890 | \$ - | \$ 890 | \$ - | \$ 890 | \$ 865 | \$ - | \$ 865 | \$ - | \$ 865 |
| San Jose | \$ 805 | \$ 1,590 | \$ 2,395 | \$ 4,599 | \$ 6,994 | \$ 805 | \$ 1,590 | \$ 2,395 | \$ 4,442 | \$ 6,837 |
| Saratoga | \$ 150 | \$ - | \$ 150 | \$ 75 | \$ 225 | \$ 150 | \$ - | \$ 150 | \$ 75 | \$ 225 |
| Thousand Oaks | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 110 | \$ 110 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 110 | \$ 110 |
| Totals | | | | | | | | | | |
| Counties | \$ 2,727,725 | \$ 22,277,250 | \$ 25,004,975 | \$ 9,752,413 | \$ 34,757,388 | \$ 2,737,860 | \$ 22,271,945 | \$ 25,009,805 | \$ 9,785,052 | \$ 34,794,857 |
| Cities | \$ 10,530 | \$ 1,590 | \$ 12,120 | \$ 14,548 | \$ 26,668 | \$ 10,160 | \$ 1,590 | \$ 11,750 | \$ 14,204 | \$ 25,954 |
| Grand Totals | \$ 2,738,255 | \$ 22,278,840 | \$ 25,017,095 | \$ 9,766,961 | \$ 34,784,056 | \$ 2,748,020 | \$ 22,273,535 | \$ 25,021,555 | \$ 9,799,256 | \$ 34,820,811 |

Table A.9

References

- Buist, Henry and others. 1995. Purchase of Development Rights and the Economics of Easements. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Economic Report 718.
- California Department of Conservation. 1989. Land in the Balance: Williamson Act Costs, Benefits, and Options. Part 1. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation.
- California Department of Conservation. 1983. The Williamson Act After Proposition 13: Still a Bargain. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation.
- California Department of Finance. 1992. *California Statistical Abstract*. Sacramento: California Department of Finance.
- California Department of Food and Agriculture. 1995. California Agricultural Statistics for 1994. Sacramento: California Department of Food and Agriculture.
- Davies, Race. 1972. *Preserving Agricultural and Open Space Lands*. Davis: University of California, Institute of Governmental Affairs, 1972.
- Eppling, John W. 1992. "The New Jersey State Planning Process: An Experiment in Intergovernmental Negotiations." In *Growth Management: The Planning Challenge of the 1990s*. Jay M. Stein, ed. Newberry Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Farmland Preservation Report, monthly.
- Fay, James S. 1993. *California Almanac*. Santa Barbara: Pacific Data Resources, 1993.
- Howe, Deborah A. 1992. "Growth Management in Oregon." In *Growth Management: The Planning Challenge of the 1990s*. Jay M. Stein, ed. Newberry Park, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. 1991. *The Impacts of Farmland Conversion in California*. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation.
- Malme, Jane. 1993. *Preferential Property Tax Treatment of Land*. Cambridge, Mass.: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Nelson, Arthur C. 1992. "Preserving Prime Farmland in the Face of Urbanization: Lessons from Oregon." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58, Autumn, 467-488.
- Snyder, J. Herbert. 1966(a). *A New Program for Agricultural Land Use Stabilization: The California Land Conservation Act of 1965*. Land Economics, February, 1966.
- Snyder, J. Herbert. 1966. *Land Economics and Land Use Criteria*. Speech delivered to Symposium on Land Use, Planning and Assessment.
- Sokolow, Alvin D. 1990. *The Williamson Act: 25 Years of Land Conservation*. Sacramento: California Department of Conservation.
- Stanford Environmental Law Society. 1974. *The Property Tax and Preservation of Open Space Land in California*. Stanford: Environmental Law Society.

Williamson Act and Related Departmental Publications

The following publications on the Williamson Act and issues related to the conservation of agricultural land are available through the Department of Conservation's Office of Land Conservation. The Office of Land Conservation may be contacted at (916) 324-0850.

Conserving the Wealth of the Land: A Plan for Soil Conservation. Summary of soil conservation problems in California, and recommended policies for dealing with them. Prepared by the Soil Conservation Advisory Committee in 1987.

Farmland Conversion Report. Biennial report of farmland conversion statistics compiled and produced by the Department's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Introduction and guide to the information provided by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.

Land in the Balance: Williamson Act Costs, Benefits, and Options. A two-part history and analysis of the Williamson Act Program.

Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal.3d 840. California Supreme Court decision which found that, as a general rule, lands can only be withdrawn from a Williamson Act contract through the nine year nonrenewal process.

Taking Action: Recommendations for Implementing the Soil Conservation Plan. Outline of specific recommendations for implementing the State Soil Conservation Plan, as developed by the interim Soil Conservation Committee in 1987.

The Impacts of Farmland Conversion in California. Study of the economic, social, and environmental effects of farmland conversion.

The Williamson Act: 25 Years of Land Conservation. Brief history, explanation, and interpretation of the first 25 years of the Williamson Act Program.

The Williamson Act After Proposition 13: Still a Bargain. Results of a survey on the Williamson Act as tax incentive after the passage of Proposition 13.

The Williamson Act Program Reference Manual. Complete administrative reference to all aspects of the Williamson Act Program (forthcoming).

The Williamson Act Status Report. Biennial report of statistics and issues concerning the Williamson Act Program.

Williamson Act Task Force Consensus for Action. Interim Report to the Secretary for Resources. Summarizes findings and recommendations of the Williamson Act Task Force, which was established in 1984 to examine the issues and problems affecting the Williamson Act.